

Sergei Kremler

Judas in the Kremlin. How they betrayed the USSR and sold Russia

"Dirty linen" of the Kremlin -



Text provided by the copyright holder

http://www.litres.ru/pages/biblio_book/?art=7059817

"Judas in the Kremlin: How they betrayed the USSR and sold Russia / Sergei Kremler.":

Yauza catalog; Moscow; 2014

ISBN 978-5-906716-16-3

annotation

According to Mikhail Poltoranin, even at the very beginning of Perestroika, he asked the ex-chairman of the State Planning Commission: "Is all this stupidity or betrayal?" - and heard in response: "Of course, betrayal!" The collapse of the USSR was neither a suicide nor a "death from natural causes" - but a deliberate murder. The mighty Superpower did not "lose the Cold War", did not "overstrain itself in the arms race" - but was killed by a dastardly stab in the back. After that, the KREMLIN JUDAS plundered Russia, as marauders rob the fallen heroes ...

This book is a merciless verdict not only to Gorbachev's "foremen of treason", but also to their current students and successors, who are still sitting in the Kremlin. This investigation sheds light on the dirtiest secrets of the anti-people regime. Revealing the secret springs of the Great Geopolitical Catastrophe, exposing not only the perpetrators, but also the customers of this "crime of the century", the leading publicist of the patriotic forces answers the main question of our history: who and how betrayed the USSR and sold Russia?

Sergei Kremler

Judas in the Kremlin: How they betrayed the USSR and sold Russia

History spoiled us. We got a lot of success relatively easily.
This has created in many complacency, a dangerous complacency...

I. V. Stalin in 1940, Works, vol. 18, p. 207

... There are few restless people in our leadership ... There are such people: if they are well, then they think that everyone is well ...

I. V. Stalin in 1947, Works, vol. 18, p. 457

... We old people will die. But we need to think to whom, into whose hands we will hand over the baton of our great cause? Who will carry it forward? This requires younger, more dedicated people, politicians...

... The politicians of the Leninist experience, educated by our party, will have to fight to break hostile attempts to slow down and frustrate the cause of building socialism and achieve complete success in the implementation of our great goals.

I. V. Stalin in 1952, Works, vol. 18, p. 584

The intelligentsia is an illusion that has cost the country and the revolution dearly, and it is high time to put an end to it.

M. Yu. Levidov, publicist, literary critic, writer, 1924

From the author

Twenty-two years ago, the most exciting superpower in history, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, disappeared from the political map of the world. However, this book is not a tribute to the past, but, as the author hopes, an extra argument in favor of the new,

revived, future Soviet Union.

A new USSR is possible, but in order for it to become a reality, not only the clearly expressed will of the peoples that made it up is necessary, but also a clear, intelligible understanding of why the first USSR fell. It is necessary to reveal clearly, with facts, the specific mechanism of the process that led to the tragedy of 1991, but it is even more necessary to identify the systemic roots of this process.

Passion is also necessary for understanding - civil and human ... At the beginning of February 1826, Pushkin, referring to the tragedy of the December Uprising, wrote to Delvig: "We will not ... be one-sided, like French tragedians; but let us look at tragedy through Shakespeare's eyes...

One can also look at the tragedy of the USSR through Shakespeare's eyes, but in general, if we ignore the tragedy of those days, it is clear that on the materials about the history of the degradation and death of the USSR - the greatest and most powerful form of the Russian state, one can not only write Shakespearean tragedies ... Oh drama and tragedy of the USSR, you can shoot dozens of action-packed, and at the same time - historically reliable, serials. They would have a place for ingenious combinations played out in a variety of conditions on all continents of the planet, and exciting power battles taking place on all the same continents and even in the depths of the seas and oceans. In these series heroism, patriotism and real male friendship would win, then deceit and betrayal... However, if the creators of such series remained true to the historical truth and did not hide from reality, meanness and treason would eventually prevail.

After all, it is these two words: "meanness" and "treason" that turn out to be the key to the tragedy of the USSR. The meanness of the outside world, or rather, the meanness of the Golden Elite of the West, who created and encouraged subversive work within the USSR ... And the betrayal of the Soviet "elite", which for decades undermined the roots of the sovereign Oak, just like the Pig did from the sad fable of Ivan Andreevich Krylov. Remember:

Pig under the ancient oak
I ate acorns to the full, to satiety ...
And she began to undermine the roots of Oak with her snout ...

It is not for nothing that the Oak in the fable says to the Pig, which is getting fat on its acorns: "Whenever you could raise your snout..." That's right: just like the self-satisfied Pig, the Soviet (and even more so the post-Soviet) "elite" is not able to turn its gaze to a truly great and high. And if so, it is not surprising that almost all current television "talk shows" and discussions with the participation of the "elite" are a collection of frank, clinical social idiots who did not understand anything about the tragedy of their own Motherland - although to the place of birth.

However, so far in the land of native aspens and birches, not only social idiots, but also honest, sensible, intelligent and right-thinking people have not yet died out. Acting compatriots, however, are not yet in abundance, but it's still not over yet - despite the next "bulk" attacks on the mind, honor, conscience and historical memory of the nation.

One way or another, the topic of the death of the USSR is becoming more and more relevant - this can be seen even from the splash on the book market of a considerable number of books on this topic. And the beginning was laid long ago - suffice it to mention the capital monograph "Treason against the State" that appeared almost ten years ago and the book "Victory" by Peter Schweitzer, which was first published in the Russian Federation in 1995, full of half-confessions and alleged confessions.

Today, only a list of such literature would take more than one page, and such a fact can only be welcomed already because tens of millions of young people live in Rossiyanin and in the CIS (this stupid abbreviation came from SiNaGog, or what?) who in 1991 were five years old, or even a year old, or even a few months before birth. Millions of young people were born after 1991... Give them first

a specific chronicle of betrayal and factography of events is not superfluous. It will not be superfluous to remember those days for older people.

The White Book of Russia published in 2013 stands out here. Construction, restructuring and reforms. 1950–2012" A. Grazhdankina and S. Kara-Murza ... This book is an important source of facts, and three hundred diagrams placed in it vividly illustrate the rise of Soviet Russia and the shame of the anti-Soviet "Rossiyanin". Unfortunately, an unfortunate inaccuracy crept into the title of the book - the word "reforms". Political reform, as Ozhegov's Dictionary of the Russian Language tells us, is "a transformation that does not affect the foundations of the existing state system." But the processes of the late 80s and early 90s destroyed the state system of the USSR, they were a political coup, a counter-revolution in its purest form and can in no way be called "reforms". The exact third word in the series "Construction, perestroika ..." is the word "catastrophe"!

In general, acquaintance with most of the books about the death of the USSR that have now been published shows that they often contain many deadly facts, there are many specific revelations, but the general analysis is weak. In addition, too often "whistleblowers" wander in the three pines - anti-Marxism, anti-Sovietism and anti-communism. The same Oleg Platonov is a sad, alas, example of this.

It's a pity...

I highly appreciate a series of books about the death of the USSR by Alexander Shevyakin - they have enough revealing facts and correct analysis, but even here there is, alas, a certain "alas", about which - a little below.

Sometimes one of the misconceptions simply falls into other misconceptions - as is the case, for example, with the former Yeltsin loyalist Mikhail Poltoranin, the author of the sensational book "Power in TNT." Reading it is useful both for young people who have not seen 1991, and for those who saw it in all its "glory". After all, our main historical task is to restore the Soviet, Socialist, Union state, and Poltoranin's confessions, albeit belated ones, help to figure out who was who, who did what, how and why he did it ..

Alas, in the analytical and even more so in the "resolutive" part, Poltoranin and the authors of other similar books are as far from the real tasks of the day as they were far from these tasks more than twenty years ago. Moreover, the phenomenon of Poltoranin must be dealt with separately - also because in this book I will refer to him more than once ...

Mikhail Poltoranin came into big politics as one of the closest people to Yeltsin. Accordingly, Poltoranin is one of those whose hands are up to the elbows in the blood of the Soviet Union, one of the major traitors to the Soviet Motherland... And this is not the opinion of Sergei Kremlev, this is an obvious historical fact.

Once, while discussing this aspect with some Muscovites, I heard: "Well, you see li, he also had his own truth, he also needs to be understood ...".

No!

There is no truth of Poltoranin, even if he reports absolutely reliable facts about the betrayal... After all, he also participated in it, in this betrayal - then, in real time, when the future of the Soviet Union was being decided...

And can this be said only about Poltoranin? And is it only about 1991? After all, the fate of the USSR was not decided overnight, it fluctuated on the scales of history for almost forty years - from the time of the elimination of Stalin and Beria and until the time of the "perestroika" catastrophe. In an interview in 2011, Poltoranin appropriately recalled the "Gosplan case" at the turn of the 40s and 50s. In this case, the former chairman of the State Planning Committee of the USSR Voznesensky was shot, and Poltoranin directly states that Voznesensky sold the most important secret documents to the West.

Even under Stalin!

However, personally, I don't go that far in Voznesensky's accusations ... For five years, from 1944 to 1949, 236 (two hundred thirty-six!) Top secret and secret documents

from the "Voznesensky" Gosplan really disappeared, but its head himself was rather an ambitious rubbish, a "narcissist" who did not see what was happening under his nose. But here is another major member of the State Planning Commission - Nikolai Baibakov-Baibak. Raised at one time by Beria to the post of People's Commissar of the USSR oil industry, he later poured lies and dirt on Beria, but even after that, Khrushchev did not come to court and was removed last in May 1957 already from the post of chairman of the State Planning Committee of the USSR.

Baibakov's second coming took place under Brezhnev. For twenty years, from October 1965 to October 1985, Baibakov again led the State Planning Committee (Gosplan) of the USSR. Then Gorbachev dismissed him, and it was time - seventy-four years! And in 1986, Poltoranin ended up in Baku next to Baibakov in the former residence of Brezhnev and asked the question - why, they say, is there "such chaos" in our economy? Where is Gosplan looking?

"Is all this stupidity or betrayal?" Poltoranin asked Baibakov in 1986. And the ex-chairman of the State Planning Commission replied: "Of course, betrayal. Gosplan has become a state within a state... a terrible audience has gathered there..."

But who, one wonders, was in charge of Gosplan from 1965 to 1985 - when, year after year, did this "terrible audience" gather there? Who collected it? Isn't it Baibakov? And how could Baibakov, knowing this, keep quiet about this - even in the era of "glasnost"?

Here it is - Judas road ... After Stalin's death - Beria's open betrayal in the name of maintaining his position. Then - the silent betrayal of Stalin at the XX Congress ... And as a result - the long-term systemic betrayal of the Soviet Union in a high government position, resignation with "washing hands", as a reward - handouts from Gorbachevism, from Yeltsinism and a peaceful death in 2008 at the 97th year life.

Biblical Judas at least strangled himself, but this one ...

Poltoranin admires Baibakov.

Oh well!

Any traitor, traitor, has two ways: either continue to stagnate in his betrayal, or sincerely, to the end, repent and atone for his deeds ... At the same time, even the outstanding heroic deeds of the former traitor cannot be evaluated in the same way as the merits and accomplishments of those who was always faithful and devoted to the motherland.

And how does Mikhail Nikiforovich Poltoranin evaluate himself in the era? Well, he clearly flaunts himself and credits himself as a hero just because in his book he dared to call the Yeltsin system inhuman and cannibalistic and declare that this system is the "Yeltsin oligarchy", "holds on bayonets to this day, becoming more and more stronger, impudent and chewing the country"... That's how it is. But Poltoranin is one of those who created this cannibalistic system! And this is also not the opinion of Sergei Kremlev, this is also an obvious historical fact.

The great son of the Russian people, Ukrainian Taras Bulba, "shaking the silvered in Cossack affairs with his head," in his speech to his comrades he said:

"I know that mean things have now begun in our land: they only think that they should have their grain stacks, stacks and horse herds, so that their sealed honey would be intact in the cellars; adopt devil knows what busurman customs; they abhor their tongue; his own does not want to talk to his own; he sells his own, as they sell a soulless creature in a trading market. The mercy of a foreign king, and not even a king, but the foul mercy of a magnate who beats them in the face with his yellow shoe, is dearer to them than any brotherhood; but the last one is a scoundrel, whatever he is, even though he is all covered in soot and worship, he, brothers, has a grain of Russian feeling; and someday he will wake up and grab his head, cursing loudly blowing his life, ready to expiate the shameful deed with torments.

Having published his book, Mikhail Nikiforovich showed that a grain of Russian feeling remained in him, that he, unlike other traitors and Judas, took a serious step towards repentance. But did he grab his head? Did I curse my life loudly? And ready

Is it not by torment - there is no need for that, but by coming under that Red banner of Lenin - Stalin, which he betrayed, to atone for his shameful participation in Yeltsinism, in the murder of the USSR?

Alas, this is not the case! And it is surprising that Alexander Shevyakin, the exact preparator of the process of betrayal of the Soviet Union by the Soviet "elite", in the collection of the publishing house "Algorithm" "Poltoranin's Cocktail", dedicated to Poltoranin and his book, writes about the "courage" of Yeltsin's former accomplice...

God have mercy! Man only partially, very, very incompletely, began to redeem his guilt before the Motherland, and immediately write him down as a hero?

I am ready to forgive Poltoranin if he goes through the path of repentance and redemption to the end... In this case, I am even ready to respect him. But admire him? Here Alexander Shevyakin disappointed me personally.

Yes, in order to understand what happened to our Motherland, we need to search for and publish facts... We need a broad historical analysis... But we also need a very specific emotional mood. We need emotions, we need passion, noble anger! .. Remember: "Let the noble rage boil like a wave ..."?

Everything must be put in its place, betrayal and betrayal must be called by their proper names and branded! At the turn of the 1980s and 1990s, Poltoranin was a false shepherd and again claims the role of a shepherd who has now supposedly regained his sight... But where is the guarantee that he will again not lead those who trusted him into the swamp of the new Yeltsinism, or even push him into the abyss? After all, he only partially recovered his sight, not at all to the end!

And what about those whom the West did not and does not nominate as "pastors", but who never erred, did not betray the Soviet Union, and served and serves it to the best of their ability all these years?

No, it's too early to dress up Poltoranin (not talking about others at all!) in the hero's toga and future savior of the Fatherland...

In my small book, a somewhat supplemented second edition of which with a slightly changed title is now offered to the reader, all the painful questions cannot be considered and solved. But it seems to me useful to give my view on the events of 1991, on the phenomena that preceded them in the life of the USSR, and on our possible future. I immediately warn you that I am not going to compete with other authors in supplying the reader with a heap of "fried" facts and revealing figures - reading the books of Platonov, Shevyakin, Mukhin, Pykhalov, Kara-Murza and so on, reading the same book by Poltoranin provides us in this regard in excess. I wanted to reveal the causes and logic of negative processes, including their origins. Indeed, in 1991, the USSR was betrayed only because it was betrayed for many years until 1991 ... I repeat: the betrayal was not a one-time act, but a process that stretched over decades. This, among other things, I wanted to show. How far I have succeeded is for the reader to judge.

In my book there are a number of strong expressions on the verge of a literary "foul". Well, there are times when the normative vocabulary is powerless to express the essence of what is happening and the emotions that are caused by what is happening. Sometimes harsh, harsh words that are unacceptable in everyday life break out of the language themselves.

For example, academician Mstislav Vsevolodovich Keldysh, long-term president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, an extremely educated person, was distinguished by the complete absence of strong expressions in his dictionary in any situations. Nevertheless, the memoirs mention a case when Keldysh, pissed off by red tape in the implementation of an important and urgent project, allowed himself at a meeting in the Academy of Sciences to express in a few, but extremely expressive words, everything that he thought about the slob. The effect was amazing - the same people managed to do everything as quickly as possible.

In the Complete Works of Lenin, his harsh words are recorded that our decrees - g ... but, departments - g ... but. Well, even the most cultured Vladimir Ilyich could not find another word for evaluating the "lawmaking" and "activities" of certain proletarian "Solons" and "Demosthenes".

Is it possible to define in strictly censored terms what happened in the vast expanses of our still uncircumcised Motherland in the late 80s and early 90s of the last century?

In censorship - hardly!

The supranational Golden Elite of the West was destroying the Soviet Union from the outside, the post-Stalinist Soviet "elite" was destroying it from the inside... But what about the peoples of the USSR? What can and should be said about their role? This is not such a simple question as it might seem at first glance. On the one hand, a lot has been written about the alleged collapse of the USSR today, although, of course, we must talk about murder - if we mean the subversive actions of the outside world and internal traitors. The murder was committed quite deliberately and intentionally.

And what about the peoples of the USSR, the peoples of Russia? After all, they did not want to kill or betray their homeland. They did not want the collapse of the Soviet Union and clearly stated this at the all-Union referendum in the spring of 1991. But not even a year has passed since the common homeland of the peoples of the USSR was destroyed.

And the people endured.

Why they endured - a separate conversation. However, I will immediately point out the main culprit for the collapse of the USSR - these are the highest circles of the Soviet, especially the capital's intelligentsia, primarily "creative", but also scientific and technical - too. This will be discussed more than once later. The highest military played a particularly unattractive role ...

Yes, the elite, one way or another, betrayed and sold the Soviet Union. And only about the ordinary people of the Land of the Soviets can and should be said that they are something of the USSR ... whether. And, by the way, not only in 1991 and 1992, but also in 1993, when the people had a distinct constitutional opportunity to give the opposite "No, no, Not really". If the peoples of Russia had unanimously responded to the second option, then neither the further shameless capitalization of Russia, nor the shooting of the White House in October 1993, nor much else would have become possible ...

The peoples of the Soviet Union missed the Soviet Union, but they can and must restore it. Vladimir Putin once said "cleverly" in the sense that, they say, those who do not regret the USSR have no heart, and those who want to restore it have no mind. Well, Putin, like his former successor, "accomplice" Medvedev, is always right in everything, but always - exactly the opposite. Listen to what they say, turn it inside out and get the truth.

So, those (except for the enemies of Russia) who rejoiced at the collapse of the USSR had no mind, and those (except for the enemies of Russia) who do not want the restoration of the USSR in one form or another have neither mind nor heart.

It remains to be understood whether the mind and heart of the people of the great country have been preserved. Not the least important is whether this people has its social "stomach" in order. After all, one more "liberal-democratic" bloody diarrhea of Russia can no longer be sustained.

At one time, the Gorbachev region introduced the concept of "foremen of perestroika" into public circulation. Today we can say with confidence that this concept turned out to be identical to the concept of "foremen of treason." But in my book I do not refer to certain "sensational" materials with transcripts of some secret speeches of the "foremen of perestroika" who were preparing treason, I do not expose the specific crimes of these "foremen of treason", I do not report who, where and when from he studied in Western anti-Soviet centers, joined London Masonic lodges, Moscow rotary clubs, etc.

About all this long and recently thick books have been written - by the same Oleg Platonov, Mikhail Poltoranin and others. This is all true, wonderful and useful - I do not argue. However, for some reason, the "load" of Russian problems is still "out there", in the sense - in the same historical "swamp" into which the Khrushchevites began to lead the country, not to mention their "ideological" and non-ideological successors from Brezhnev to the present Kremlin "tandem". So, maybe the "whistleblowers" do not expose what they should? Or what follows, but - not

So? They "expose" from the wrong political and moral positions, without noble anger, without an accurate aim ...

That is, there is a swing, and there is a blow, but - not on target!

Whether, for example, it is now of fundamental importance whether Misha Gorbachev plucked or not plucked chickens for German soldiers in the Kuban and gave or did not give the Abwehr a cooperation agreement (the Germans recruited 12-year-olds for future use). What if we find out that he gave this subscription, it will change something in his portrait of the greatest Judas of all times and all peoples?

Is it really so important that and when Gavriil Popov and Sobchak, Chubais or Burbulis said, did Boris Yeltsin achieve or did not achieve the highest Masonic degrees of "initiation"? Without this, it is clear that they are enemies of Russia. And enemies precisely because they are anti-Soviet and anti-communist, or rather, have become a tool of anti-Soviet and anti-communist.

Well, what will even the most detailed description of the secrets of August 1991 give us? The main secret of the US nuclear project ceased to be a secret immediately after Hiroshima burned down in an atomic fire. After all, the main "atomic" secret of the United States was that they have an atomic bomb. After the bomb was publicly detonated, the mystery evaporated. So in the events of 1991, the main secret was that the country was deliberately destroyed by its own "top". Not this or that specific person, but the highest stratum of the party and state leadership of the USSR - with the rarest exceptions. Today, after the "elite" blew up the USSR, this secret is no longer a secret. And how exactly this was done is not very important. As the Soviet physicist Yakov Zeldovich used to say: "Without which syrup there is no sparkling water, it's no longer interesting!"

Is it really so important whether or not the Western special services hooked a certain KGB lieutenant colonel in their time? This, too, will not change anything in the political and human appearance that he created for himself! For many years, having huge opportunities for the creative transformation of the country, this lieutenant colonel has been ruining and ruining it all these years. Well, even if the West suddenly sets him up by publishing subscriptions and receipts, what will this add to understanding the situation on the merits?

By God, comrades, today you can find more important and more interesting topics. And I will try to do it. Although...

Although one of my intelligent acquaintances said a long time ago: "Democracy is when you can to say anything, nothing will change anyway"... And now we have democracy.

And - very thickened.

But you still need to speak.

Essentially!

And not only to talk ... It's time to do it, starting with the unification of all people who love the Motherland, otherwise instead of unification, so far there is only another "swamp" "bulk"...

When, as he was later called, the "Bolshevik on the throne", Tsar Peter, began to raise Russia from its prostrate side to its feet, the southern Russian black soil was meters thick. However, there were not so many people who understood the matter in Russia at that time.

By the time the Bolshevik Lenin began his turn of Russia from a semi-colony to a great industrial power, the thickness of the black soil had shrunk significantly, although the number of people who understood the matter had increased in Russia. That is, Russia was becoming increasingly poor in black soil, but at least smart and active people did not become poor, but grew. No doubt, this is not the most optimistic reverse progression, but still...

Today chernozems have thinned even more, they don't "pull" even half a meter, but with the growth of the number of people who understand the essence of the matter, something has bogged down Russia - their number is not very much increasing, and even decreasing. But if the process of rapid growth of understanding does not go well with us and the number of those who understand does not increase quickly to the required size, then another ten years, and we will have neither black soil nor Russia.

Yes, much of what used to be secret is increasingly becoming clear today. And an increasing number

people begin to understand how we were "thrown". They understand this, but they don't understand why... They don't understand that it wasn't just Russia that interfered with the West, but Soviet Russia, the Soviet Union... nothing more than a pretense, a booth, shooting decoys.

This also needs to be understood...

And no matter how, I repeat, it doesn't turn out that the number of understanding people necessary to change the situation will be recruited just by the time when our black soil is completely depleted and it will be almost impossible to change the situation.

It will be bad for us then, dear friends ... So, to understand what we need to do hurry up.

I am fully aware that the book offered to readers is unlikely to pull out our public cart, stuck in the "swamp" of unlucky post-Yeltsinism, onto the firm ground of Truth. Even dragging a hippopotamus out of a swamp is not an easy job, and even a whole huge country - especially. Especially when the country is once again being dragged into the "swamp" of dangerous rallies. But I hope that this book of mine, like the previous ones, will push the situation in the right direction - out of the swamp.

And this, comrades, is not so little!

Sergei Kremlev (Brezkun)

Prologue

"G ... but" in the role of "brain"

Dictionaries call the prologue an introductory part to a drama, novel, performance, etc., which is the introductory, initial part of the work, sometimes introduces the events preceding the action. Any of these definitions of prologue is suitable for what I want to tell the reader at the beginning of the book.

And I want to say first of all about the stratum of Soviet society that played the most fatal role in the fate of the USSR. No external forces could have brought down the USSR, and no systemic weaknesses of socialism could have destroyed Soviet socialism, if the USSR and socialism in the USSR had not been brought down not even by the "fifth column" (this goes without saying), but by the mass hysteria of Soviet educated circles - in capitals, but also in the periphery.

Back in old, tsarist Russia, Russian intellectuals, especially representatives of the "creative" "free" professions, themselves appropriated the name of the "brain of the nation". However, our entire recent history from the end of the 19th century to the beginning of the 21st century proves that it is precisely those who have claimed and are still claiming such a proud and responsible self-determination that deserve the exact opposite assessment - not "the brain", but "Mr. of the nation".

Sharp?

Yes?

Not very educated and literary?

Do not deny.

But it is well-deserved.

And if we talk about the old Russian and current "Russian creative intellectuals", using the image of the brain, then we need to talk about the hopeless and, it seems, incurable *softening* of this "brain", moreover, it is stuffed full of "spiritual" "dung. (Or maybe, damn it, he knows this "educated" - and with real manure, of her own production).

The topic of this long-softened "brain of the nation" is of paramount importance for understanding our past, present and future, so I will start with it, and in the course of my reflections I will return to it more than once.

However, in order...

The collapse of the USSR in 1991 was a very diverse process, including a performance for some. But the performance was different for different figures and faces - a tragedy, a drama, a farce, for everyone.

At the same time, 1991 was the beginning of the newest novel in the historical epic of Russia.

A novel, as again explanatory dictionaries tell us, is an epic multifaceted work that widely embraces life, depicts the social process in its contradictions, diversity and development. The novel intertwines many storylines, a large number of characters appear. At the same time, there are many varieties of the novel: historical, social, political, military, satirical, psychological, fantastic, adventurous, etc.

Well, in the events preceding 1991, and in 1991, many plots and destinies were intertwined, and these events had all the aspects mentioned above - from historical to adventurous, although, oddly enough, a fantastic plot prevailed. After all, in a matter of months in 1991 and 1992, unthinkable situations that seemed to surpass any fantasy miraculously turned into an absurd reality.

Although...

Although, was the plot of that time so fantastic, if already in the autumn of 1952 Stalin warned the young political elite of the CPSU that it would have to face hostile attempts not only to slow down, but also to disrupt the cause of building socialism?

That's how! *Not only to slow down, but also to disrupt ...*

The fact that Stalin was right was proven by life itself. Today, taking a close look at our post-war history, one can clearly see how for decades, long before 1991, quite successful attempts were made to slow down the building of socialism in the USSR. As a result, the work of building socialism was completely disrupted from the beginning of the 90s, and today Russia, if we bear in mind its economic position in the world, has been thrown back a hundred years.

But what contributed to the development of the "action" of the summer and autumn of 1991? What needs to be said in the prologue of the story of that accursed year and the years before it?

Perhaps, first of all, it is necessary to say about the long-standing ulcer of Russian society, about the worst edition of the already not very attractive world intelligentsia - about the "Russian intelligentsia".

The absurdity of "perestroika" and "post-perestroika" was an absurdity only outwardly – it had an iron logic, built for decades *not by us*. Those who plotted the liquidation of the USSR had to be so brainwashed, so dumbfounded people that some were paralyzed, while others, so to speak, were puppetized, or, if more familiar, zombified. But who polluted the brain and soul of the people with spiritual manure, who zombified the people, who manipulated public consciousness, if not the "Soviet intellectuals"? Moreover, many - not even for thirty pieces of silver, not for lentil stew, but *because of stupidity ...*

Our time is called Troubled, but the first letter is superfluous here. We are experiencing not the Troubled, but the Troubled Time in the history of Russia. A synonym for the word "vague" is the word "obscure", and the word "muddy" is a synonym for the word "dirty". So, for a citizen who knows how to think, the current situation in the "Rossiyanin" is as clear as this situation is dirty. *And why is the social situation so polluted and clouded? Yes, because it was deliberately muddied.*

But who managed to stir up our lives like that?

But who, if not those who had and have the greatest influence on the formation of public opinion?! Those whom people are accustomed to believing, and whom, knowing only from a television "picture" or magazine and newspaper articles, they are accustomed to consider almost close, well-known people. I mean, of course, the elite layer of the "intelligentsia" of both Russian capitals, as well as - descending "cream of society" in

national capitals of the republics of the USSR and in a number of large regional centers - Gorky, Novosibirsk, Donetsk, Rostov, Odessa, Omsk, Tomsk, etc. The layer that from printed pages and television screens created and creates a very definite social background in the 80s, 90s and 2000s.

Not a single member of the Brezhnev or Gorbachev Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU has ever enjoyed in Soviet society a small share of such informal influence as all these Burlatsky, Pozners, Bovins, Rasputins, Astafyevs, Likhachevs, Nevzorovs and Voznesenskys with various Yevtushenks, Govorukhins, Ryazanovs and Okudzhavs used .

And all of them (and others like them, whose name is legion), instead of revealing the accumulated painful problems of the USSR in the interests of renewing socialism, began, after Gorbachev came to power, to denigrate the very idea of the USSR, the very system that created it, and all Soviet history.

This situation was unparalleled in world history *in terms of the scale of* almost universal betrayal by the "elite" of their people and their homeland. However, *in a systemic sense*, the case was very ordinary, described in the literature. So, more than forty years ago, the American philosopher Burroughs Dunham, who for a long time headed the department at Temple University in Philadelphia, wrote the book Thinkers and Treasurers. The "treasurers" meant the rulers of exploitative societies from pharaohs to billionaires and presidents, while the "thinkers" meant those who form public opinion, from ancient Egyptian priests to television commentators.

The American professor gave the first place in influencing the social situation to "thinkers", placing them before the "treasurers". Indeed, *from a certain point on, the role of the media in the decline of society turns out to be even more significant than the role and importance of those who have full state and economic power and whom the "thinkers" serve.*

Here is what Dunham wrote:

"In the heyday of public institutions (and therefore treasurers) can afford the luxury of making the truth public ... In a period of decline, public institutions (and therefore treasurers) cannot allow the truth to become common property ... This leads to the fact that that... some true judgments bring punishment, while some false judgments bring honor and glory.

.... This is how a contradiction arises ... between the actual picture of the world and the picture of the world that thinkers create by order of the treasurers ... "

Moreover, further Dunham quite rightly admits that in the depths of an exploiting society "ideas always ripen that harm the ruling class precisely by the fact that it (*the obsolete society*. - S.K.) is correctly described."

"The Russian-Russian "society" after 1991 took shape as unconditionally exploitative with the following composition of the exploiters: former partocrats and former criminals, including "shadow business"; rogue former Komsomol and trade union workers - both apparatchiks and those who worked in the economy; foreign "investors" and domestic vultures-"entrepreneurs" of various kinds and origins, as well as other bastards, which there is no great need to classify.

Therefore, Dunham's long-standing conclusion that fair ideas always ripen in the depths of an unjust society can, with a clear conscience, be extended to the modern Rossiyanie.

But why haven't these ideas taken hold of the masses yet? *Why are the newly-minted "treasurers" in the Russian Federation and the CIS, like the long-standing "treasurers" of the West, over and over again being able to take actions that contradict the most vital interests of the absolute majority of society?*

Dunham captures the essence of the problem and explains: it becomes possible

because the "treasurers" are helped by "thinkers".

"The treasurer intimidates, the thinker deceives," Dunham writes.

There is nothing to argue with here - I myself say the same thing. And the people, deceived by the "thinkers" on the orders of the "treasurers", allow themselves to be led not to lasting prosperity, but to the decline of all social institutions. As we see it in the current "Rossiyanin".

"And in the Soviet Union? What, his public institutions didn't rot?" - Maybe throw up a "note" "liberal", "democrat" or "liberal democrat".

They rotted, rotted, otherwise the USSR would not have collapsed.

But why did they rot? We are talking about this ahead of us. In the meantime, let me remind you that "the shell of lawlessness swims in the ocean of stupidity." And it is the "thinkers" who give rise to this "ocean" in society. *The peoples of the USSR and the Russian Federation owe social stupidity, social idiocy not to nature, but to those who can deftly whitewash the black and throw mud at the white.* The people owe their seeming "stupidity" to "thinkers" who know how to defame true judgments and facts in the eyes of the people and pass off false judgments as true ones.

Without a decent education and good development, such tricks - with the substitution of truth for lies and vice versa - cannot be demonstrated to the public. However, at the disposal of the "oligarchs" - "treasurers" there has always been and is in abundance a wide range of "thinkers" - from direct informational servants of the world and "Russian" capitalist "elite" to refined "intellectuals", who, with very modest mental abilities, claimed and claim to be the "brain" and "soul" of the "nation", but are only capable of deceiving all kinds - from self-deception to deceiving the masses.

Here, for example, is the "political scientist" and "philosopher" Igor Moiseevich Klyamkin, a figure now almost forgotten, but in the years of perestroika popularized in every possible way. Then in the Novy Mir magazine, which had huge circulation during the years of "totalitarianism", and now I don't know - existing, his article was published with the title "Which Road Leads to the Temple?". The name, it should be noted, was curious - after all, freemasons, freemasons, persistently lead the world to their own "Temple". But this is so - by the way.

In the troubled 90s, this Doctor of Philosophy worked as the head of the analytical center "Public Opinion Foundation" (I wonder where the money came from?) And floats on the surface of the anti-social process to this day.

On April 13, 2011, someone Lyubov Borusyak talked to him already as with the vice-president of the Liberal Mission Foundation (I wonder where the money comes from now?). This conversation is interesting only for one thing - confirmation that there are no two varieties of Russian "intellectuals" - anti-Soviet, like some odorous substance, and that in twenty years they have not changed at all - they all look the same - narcissistic, primitive and ridiculously pretentious .

Of course, Klyamkin is a typical "thinker". But I remembered him because During the conversation, he referred to the revealing statement of the actor Oleg Basilashvili:

"We supported Boris Nikolaevich very much. We brought him to power, and then let him do it. He knows what to do."

Yeltsin was brought to power, of course, not by "intellectuals," not by an "intellectual" class, as Klyamkin put it, but by quite definite forces. However, such a self-assessment of Basilashvili, one of the representatives of the "intellectual" (well, well) "class", is quite revealing.

In a sense, it was various kinds of basilashvili and other Radzins, posners and urns that turned out to be the main destroyers of the Soviet Union. *The people were silent in 1991, primarily because this year and in previous years, the emerging "Russian" "intellectual class" of the Klyamkins and Borusyaks was too throaty.*

In the 1980s, Moscow acquaintances told me about a certain Moscow poet, a not stupid but unrestrained man. This poet in the restaurant of the Central House of Writers in his hearts drove a beer mug on the strong crown of one of the members of the "Brezhnev" Presidium of the Union of Soviet (well, well!) Writers and spent several years in a colony for this "feat". Coming out, he once said: "Even thieves have some laws and some kind of morality. And only "Soviet writers" are spiders in a jar that can only eat each other."

Well, there was a reason for these words. However, it would be more correct to expand the circle "spiders" to the general limits of the entire metropolitan "intelligent class".

Exceptions - as the future would show - were very few. And so I came up with my version of a certain infamous "catch-phrase" a long time ago, often attributed to Joseph Goebbels, although he is not the author of it. In 1932, the playwright Hans Jost (1890–1978), future president of the Imperial Chamber of Literature of the Third Reich, put the following words into the mouth of one of the characters in his play *Schlageter*: "When I hear the word culture, I want to pull the trigger on my Browning "(option: "... my hand reaches for the trigger of the gun").

So, when I hear the word "intelligentsia" ...

However, about this and other things that *are not customary* to talk about in the "intelligent" society, - in the second chapter ...

Chapter 1

Decay or collapse?

Peter Schweitzer's book *Victory*, mentioned in the address "From the Author", states that the USSR disappeared from the world map not as a result of the failure of perestroika and not as a result of conspiracies. The USSR, they say, simply could no longer exist, because both the state ideology and the economy of the USSR allegedly went bankrupt. Moreover, as Schweitzer claims, communism is contrary to human nature. (I leave the last statement on the conscience of the author, if, of course, he has it with such statements.)

Alas, books like Schweitzer's are essentially tricks. The task of the magician do something in front of the audience so that the audience does not understand what the trick is. And for this it is necessary to deftly divert the attention of the public to something else. So does Schweitzer! It seems that his book is dedicated to the US victory over the USSR. If there was a victory, then there was a war. And if there was a war, it means that there were both its plans and its intention.

But this is where Schweitzer's tricks begin. He seems to recognize the important role of the United States in the death of the USSR, but at the same time he assures that there were no "conspiracies", the United States simply led a line to deplete the economy of the USSR, and as a result, the clumsy Russian monster became decrepit and collapsed. Allegedly even somewhat unexpected for the United States.

But to say just like that means to rather cause distrust in oneself - there are too many facts proving the opposite. Many already understand that if it were not for the subversive work of the West, the USSR would exist to this day. And therefore, Schweitzer (and not him alone), counting on gaining the reader's trust, agrees in advance with the very obvious idea that an analysis of the causes of the death of the USSR outside the context of US policy resembles such an investigation in the case of a suspicious death, when the possibility of a violent death is not accepted at all in calculation.

And even if the deceased was terminally ill, Schweitzer rants, everything equally, they say, it is necessary to understand - but was not his inevitable, alas, death hastened, etc.?

All this is nothing more than maneuvers that distract us from the essence of the matter. But life is arranged in such a way that even a skilled liar, if he wants to give his lies the appearance of truth, is forced to tell ... the truth every now and then. At least partially. Therefore, books like Schweitzer's book must be read skillfully - sifting out the truth of the facts from the lies of their interpretation. I strongly advise the reader to keep this in mind.

The facts cited by the Schweitzers and showing the role of the US secret strategy in

collapse of the USSR, we need to take note - also not without caution, of course. But *the "analysis"* by Schweitzers of the causes of the death of the USSR itself requires careful analysis, X-ray, so to speak, research to detect a "double bottom".

However, the analysis of Schweitzer's book is not part of my task now, and I will simply say that by 1991 the USSR was really sick - not incurably, but seriously. We will talk about this disease itself, and about the factors that caused it. Including whether the USSR collapsed due to natural causes or was deliberately and unnaturally collapsed ...

In sports there is a concept of "qualification". This is a check of the minimum level of qualification of athletes, if they are not met, they are not allowed to the main competitions.

Today, the minimum level of political development of the interlocutor can be judged by how he assesses what happened to the USSR - as a collapse (of which the "intellectuals" and "democrats" assure us) or as a collapse?

What it was - disintegration or collapse - we will still find out. Now, a few words about empires.

Tsarist Russia and the USSR, even people who are very loyal to them, are often considered empires. However, neither the Russian Empire, nor, moreover, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were empires. On reflection, it is not so difficult to understand this, despite the unconditional evidence that Russia has always been a multinational state (and, by the way, cannot but be one).

All true empires have irreversibly collapsed. Here it is necessary to speak only about the collapse.

The empires of the Macedonian Charles were military-administrative conglomerates and fell due to incompatibility of their various parts, united by the personalities of Alexander and Charles.

The Roman Empire fell under the external pressure of the barbarians, and also under the pressure of internal greed, unwillingness and inability to give equal rights to all the peoples of the empire.

The Austro-Hungarian Empire fell not only as a result of the war, but also because it did not want to transform itself into an economically viable and possible equal federation of the peoples under Vienna's hand.

The British Empire collapsed as a result of powerful and *objectively* determined national liberation processes in its various parts.

At the same time, none of the empires mentioned above, having collapsed, did not recover. Although the Britons, for example, were so able to tie the former colonies to themselves economically that the British Commonwealth still exists.

Genuine empires cannot help falling apart and always do. But the Russian multinational state, named "empire" in honor of Peter's victory in the Northern War, withstood the hardest tests of the First World War, revolution and Civil War and did not fall apart. No matter how hard the forces hostile to the peoples and local separatists tried to break up the Russian "empire" to the stage of irreversible collapse, it did not fall apart, but quickly recovered again - in the form of the USSR.

And the reason for this was not the "imperial ambitions" of Moscow, not its "imperial will", etc. If it were not for the clearly expressed will of the peoples that were part of the Russian state before 1917, there would be no USSR. And the will of the peoples of the Russian "empire" was ultimately determined by the fact that these peoples understood that a single powerful state under the hand of the triune Russian people meets the interests of the peoples.

That is why it was decided to build a new Russia not as a unitary state with a system of national-cultural autonomies, but as a system of national republics. And this principle also withstood the most difficult tests of war and devastation. By the way, let the connoisseurs of history point out at least one true empire in which the metropolis (Centre) would develop colonies (periphery) at a faster pace than it developed itself. And in the USSR, Lenin already put forward the thesis about the need to develop the national outskirts at a faster pace than the Center. This principle has been implemented

Stalin, and later maintained even with obvious damage to the Center. In empires, this does not happen and cannot be!

But *on a level*, as they say, place, in peacetime, without any external aggression, a huge state - one of the two superpowers of the world - ceased to exist.

Why?

This question has been and is being asked to this day. Although for those who understood the essence what was happening, everything was clear already in 1991 and even earlier. I will say more about this.

But still - collapse or collapse?

Definitely a collapse. And we must remember that in Russian the word collapse means both the result and the process. They say: "We found a complete collapse", but they also say: "The collapse is in full swing."

So, I am deeply convinced that the collapse of the USSR is not a completed, but still ongoing process. Many believe that the USSR in 1991 was struck by a mortal blow, but its pulse - albeit very weak, "threadlike" - can still be felt.

But why did the collapse become possible?

Investigating the circumstances of the death of the USSR, one can write more than one book, and today not only separate thick volumes on this subject appear on the book market, but entire book series about the death of the USSR are already appearing.

The former secret is becoming more and more obvious.

However, I personally have little interest in whether Mikhail Gorbachev slept with Margaret Thatcher, for example, or did not sleep with Margaret Thatcher before betraying the Soviet Motherland? And so on ... As the Hero of Socialist Labor "bombermaker" Zeldovich jokingly used to say three times: "And without which syrup there is no sparkling water, it doesn't matter."

*So is it "influencing" what certain details of the process were?
death of the USSR?*

For the present and future, it is more important to understand the systemic essence of what happened, to establish the main motives and causes. After all, the criminal investigation begins precisely with this - with the motives and reasons that determine the nature of the crime.

So Peter Schweitzer tells us the same thing.

And what was the nature of the crime against the USSR? Briefly, we can say: "The USSR was falling apart and falling apart. And the process can still be reversed." But someone may disagree with me and object: "Even if it was not a collapse, but a collapse, the USSR is still a corpse now, which will never be resurrected."

Well, within the framework of our investigation, it is permissible to proceed from a working hypothesis that the USSR is no longer at death's door, but is a corpse. But even if this is so (although it is not), it is necessary to answer the question - what did happen: death from natural causes, suicide or premeditated, deliberate murder?

Let's consider these options.

The first is death from natural causes, from decrepitude. For more than two decades, "dear Russians" and the whole world have been convinced that it was so. "Decay, Decay!" - with perseverance, the barkers are trying to explain to us precisely this version of the explanation of what happened.

But what kind of decrepitude can we talk about if the economic and social indicators of even Gorbachev's USSR put us somewhere in the first place, somewhere in the second, where in the fifth place in the world, but certainly not lower than the last place in the top ten world?

This is how things were in the world and in the USSR five years before the death of the USSR with housing, for example, construction. Table 1 shows how many apartments were built in 1986 in the top ten countries in the world.

Table 1

Страна	Тыс. квартир	Квартир на 10 000 чел. насел.
Япония	1236	102
Финляндия	50	102
Австралия	136	91
СССР	2100	75
Швейцария	48	75
ГДР	119	72
США	1703	71
Франция	372	68
Нидерланды	98	68
Венгрия	69	65

At the same time, the rent in the USSR was the lowest in the world, amounting, including utilities, to about 3% of the expenses of an average Soviet family *and has remained unchanged since 1928*.

In the United States and England, apartment expenses accounted for approximately 20% of total family expenses, while between 1981 and 1986 rents increased in Italy by 127%, in England by 77%, in France by 68%, in Canada by 48%. %, in the USA - by 46%.

In 1986, we ranked first in the world in terms of the number of doctors (including per 10,000 population) (42.7 doctors per 10,000 population). According to the specific indicator, Czechoslovakia was in second place; Bulgaria and Hungary are in third and fourth place, the USA is in ninth place, Poland is in tenth place. Japan, with 19.8 doctors per 10,000 population, ranked fourteenth in the world.

Absolutely the first place in the world, including the specific indicator, we occupied in 1986 in terms of the number of hospital beds - 130 units per 10 thousand of the population. Japan was in second place in terms of the specific indicator, and Germany was in third. England ranked tenth, the US thirteenth. At the same time, in the capitalist countries, the cost of medical care was constantly growing (in the USA by 63% in 1981–1986).

For comparison, the number of hospital beds in the Russian Federation has been steadily declining, from 131 units per 10,000 population in 1992 to 109 in 2006. In the RSFSR, the process was reversed: the specific number of hospital beds increased from 1970 to 1986 from 112.5 to 135.2 beds.

If the Russian Federation had maintained Soviet growth rates, today the specific number of beds in the Russian Federation should have been at least 160. And the same can be said about any other social indicator - if Soviet power was preserved in Russia, it would be one and a half times more than in capitalized "Russian".

So, the question is, is it possible to talk about the decrepitude of Soviet Russia by the beginning of the 90s? Rather, we can talk about the complete decrepitude and degradation over the past twenty years, "Rossiyanin".

I will give some more data on the number of students in the top ten in the world and will limit myself to this.

They are given in table 2.

table 2

Страна	Тыс. чел.	На 10 000 чел. насел.
Канада	692	278
США	6169	263
Куба	235	232
СССР	5088	181
Франция	867	158
Югославия	369	156
Япония	1718	142
ФРГ	816	138
Монголия	25	130
Чехословакия	169	109

At the same time, the quality of Soviet higher education was high, and education itself was completely free, and even a scholarship was paid. In the leading Soviet technical universities, a fifth-year student received a scholarship above the minimum wage, in today's prices - about 10 thousand rubles.

Stubborn figures, as we see, prove that in the USSR massively, at the level of the leading countries of the world, housing was built, and it was massively available. It can be seen that in the USSR the matter of protecting health and education was very well put. In general, the statistical appearance of the USSR also looked very convincing, starting with the national income and ending with social spending.

And this is decrepitude?

Of course not! *In socio-economic terms, the USSR on the eve of its death was a completely viable organism.*

Therefore, the second option - suicide, if we mean the entire Soviet society and the USSR as a whole, cannot be taken seriously either. In their right mind and clear memory, without "cockroaches" and "dung" in the head, no one ends up with himself - for no reason at all. Another thing is that even a healthy person can be stupefied and bring him, who is in an insane state, to a fatal end. And now this is closer to the truth. If the USSR committed suicide, then it was brought to him!

Who? Well, of course, as already mentioned, the "elite" Soviet intelligentsia in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Kharkov, Gorky, Odessa, Novosibirsk, Omsk, Tomsk, Sverdlovsk, Donetsk, Tbilisi, etc. She behaved at the end of 80 -s and early 90s as a pack of mad dogs that bite everything and everyone indiscriminately, but above all - the hand that feeds them.

And they were furious, as they say, "with fat." They considered themselves "infringed", "not free", although, compared with Western intellectuals, they had almost unlimited opportunities to create genuine cultural values, increasing in the world not the number of cacophonous "symphonies" and theaters of the absurd, but new beautiful music, songs, films, paintings and books.

What, for example, was filmed by Yeltsin's best friend, film director Eldar Ryazanov, in the USSR? He shot three, without exaggeration, world masterpieces: "Carnival Night", "Hussar Ballad" and "Beware of the Car!", as well as several other excellent or not bad films.

And what did the same Eldar Ryazanov shoot under the wing of his best friend in The Russian? That's it!

Not a single genuine talent was ignored in the USSR, unlike the Russian Federation. For twenty anti-Soviet years, almost nothing remarkable was created in Rossiyanin

not a single bright creative personality has appeared in any form of art! It is impossible, in fact, to consider as such a number of businessmen-singers, businessmen-musicians and businessmen-dancers from the classics! A few modern masters of culture have extraordinary creative potential to the extent that they continue the best traditions of Russian and Soviet art - such as the watercolorist Andriyaka.

When they mean the upper strata, they talk about the "cream of society." It was the "cream" that the Soviet "intelligent elite" fancied itself to be. However, she forgot that from above, on the surface of events, there is also, sorry, *shit*. And this definition for the Soviet "elite" was more suitable - along with the definition of it as a pack of rabid dogs.

But in addition to the stinking, rotten to the point of *shit* intellectual "cream" in Soviet society by the mid-80s, a very massive layer of semi-intellectuals, "educated", "lumpen-intelligentsia" was firmly established. And now they should be compared rather with a flock of mad lemming mice. All of a sudden, suddenly possessed by an irresistible craving for collective suicide, these polar mice sometimes rush into the cold waters and drown, drown, drown.

The rats, enchanted by the sounds from the pipe of the Pied Piper of Hamelin, went to death, forced by someone else's will. As for our home-grown *intellemmings*, they were striving for the death of the Power that fed, watered and educated them at the very least without coercion! It seemed that a crazy melody of self-destruction sounded in the very depths of their awkward souls.

Who played on the hidden strings remains a mystery to me to this day. The simplest answer - the CIA, etc. - is correct, but too simple. Of course, the atmosphere that prevailed in the country by the summer of 1991 had been carefully prepared for decades. And yet, what happened in the USSR in the summer of 1991 does not fit into any theories of psychoanalysis, cannot be clearly explained by any schools of psychiatry, does not fit into any logical schemes.

Although one quite logical conclusion must be drawn from the then bacchanalia of social absurdity: any bohemian or, on the contrary, leader's encroachments of Russian "intellectuals" must be stifled in the bud. This was well understood by the intelligent, sometimes bilious, but deep (obviously, therefore, forgotten) Soviet intellectual Mikhail Yulievich Devidov, who in 1924 called the intelligentsia an illusion that costs the people very dearly.

"Ezhovye" (not from the People's Commissar of the NKVD Yezhov, but from a Russian idiom) "mittens" for "thinkers" are simply necessary. In confirmation of this idea, I will refer to none other than Pushkin. The same one, Alexander Sergeevich, the singer of freedom. In his not very well-known work "Journey from Moscow to St. Petersburg" (of course, this was a response to Radishchev's "Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow"), Pushkin wrote:

"... writers in all countries of the world are the smallest class of the entire population. And it is obvious that aristocracy is the most dangerous - there is an aristocracy of people who impose their passions, their prejudices on entire generations ... No government can resist the all-destructive effect of the printing projectile (*now - and the television screen.* - S.K.). Respect the class of writers, but don't let it take over you completely.

A warning - especially for the Russian people - for the ages! It is a pity that the broad masses of Soviet people did not heed him in the 50s, 60s, 70s, 80s and subsequent years. After all, how many good, if you think about it, people have been polluted with the brains of various kinds of self-styled "rulers of souls", published both by "Samizdat" and "Tamizdat", and, alas, by completely legal, state-owned Soviet publishing houses.

And how many they pollute the brains to this day!

Mass whims of Moscow and other cuisines never surfaced in the USSR to the level

the upper layer - that is, to the level of the "elite" shit that densely covered the life of Soviet society. On the contrary, often kitchen "vitii" sank to the social bottom. But even at the bottom they still existed, and did not die out.

After the death of the USSR, this layer - as a phenomenon - simply self-destructed, and today, if it exists, it is only as a bohemian entertainment for the nouveau riche. But once the "vitii" claimed to turn both Russia and the whole world.

Turned over.

Finally, *the third option for the death of the USSR is a contracted premeditated murder*. Do we have grounds to dwell on it as reflecting reality?

Undoubtedly! He reflects it. Today, this is more and more often not hidden by the killers themselves, both from among the figures of the "fifth column" in the USSR, and from their foreign leadership. Actually, the murder of the USSR could not have been unintentional one way or another! And it was intended, and much earlier than it seems to most today. I will talk about this in chapter 5 "Kill before birth" and chapter 6 "Foremen of treason: from Gorbachev to Trotsky ...".

Yes, the Soviet Union fell victim to a crime. And there can be no doubt that this was a multiple-reserved premeditated murder. For the USSR, a treacherous knife was being prepared for a long time in the back from the "fifth column", that is, direct traitors ...

The murder of the USSR was skillfully incited by neurasthenic, agitated, intelligent half-fools - like the monk Jacques Clement was incited to the French King Henry IV ...

The USSR was skillfully poisoned for decades with the poisons of external subversion.

The USSR was weakened, collapsed in order to kill.

And possibly killed.

And perhaps not!

Chapter 2

When I hear the word "intelligentsia"...

At the end of the prologue of this book, I informed the reader that for a long time I had my own version of the infamous "winged" phrase from Hans Jost's play "Schlageter": "When I hear the word "culture", my hand reaches for the trigger of the gun.

As for the author of this book, for many years now, when I hear the word "intelligentsia", my hand reaches *for the rod!*

And that's why...

The famous Russian historian Vasily Osipovich Klyuchevsky classified intelligence like this:

"1) People with a patchwork worldview sewn from scraps of newspapers and magazines. 2) Sectarians with hardened commandments, but without a way of thinking and even without the ability to think. 3) Slivers floating with the flow, with the same words and appetites.

The concept of "intelligentsia" was first used by the writer Pyotr Dmitrievich Boborykin, a man of fate, it should be noted, not very ordinary: from the nobility, was born in 1836 in Nizhny Novgorod, died in 1921 in Lugano, Switzerland, but not as a white émigré, because he did not live in Russia since 1865, visiting his homeland only on short visits. Boborykin launched *the word* into circulation in the 70s of the XIX century, and in the 90s of the same century Klyuchevsky wrote:

"This word has recently come into use with us. It is ugly, although it has a classical origin. It is ugly because it is inaccurate, it means not what it wants to denote. It means a person *who understands*, and it is called a person who has *an education*. Maybe the need to re-sound an educated Russian person

in the intelligentsia it is inspired by a semi-conscious, pathological process that takes place in Russian society and an example of a well-aimed diagnosis of which is given in the proverb: "Whoever hurts, he talks about it." Isn't that why a word has turned up that confuses education with understanding, because *the ability of understanding in an educated Russian person becomes a sore spot* "(emphasis added by me. - S.K.).

Klyuchevsky traced the problem from the time of pre-Petrine times and concluded with words that are surprisingly modern, fully suitable for assessing both "politicians" in the "intelligentsia" kitchens of the 70s and 80s, and current "political scientists", "sociologists", "ideologists" and others. "thinkers" in "Russian":

"The proud Russian intellectual found himself in an awkward position: *what he knew turned out to be unnecessary, and what he needed he did not know*. He knew the sublime legend about the moral decline of the world and about the transformation of Moscow into the Third Rome, but knowledge of artillery, fortification, mining, medical knowledge was needed to save the Third Rome from the fallen world. He could count on his fingers all the heresies of Roman, Luthor or Armenian, but he did not know the blatant domestic vices or pretended not to notice ... An educated Russian man knew Russian reality as it is, but did not guess what she needed and what he should do "...

Reading this, I involuntarily and inevitably remember many, alas, very many ...

And - all the past twists and turns of the times of "stagnation" and then - "catastrophes".

And - the twist of the era of thickened Yeltsinism.

And most of the current "intelligent" participants in various "talk shows" on various channels of Russian television.

The historical and social ignorance of all these Klyamkins, Urnovs, Mlechins, Svanidzes, Zhirinovskys, etc., etc., is most often striking, especially against the background of their exorbitant ambitions, amazing impudence and conceit.

They stubbornly think of themselves as the "brain of the nation", when in reality they are, um... something else.

They, these "foremen of treason" - some with experience, and some recently called - claim a monopoly on truth (of course, of an anti-Soviet type), but *for today's "thinkers", as well as for today's rulers, Truth is unbearable just as bright light is unbearable for cockroaches*.

Let us return, however, to Klyuchevsky. Does his assessment mean that in our Fatherland in the bygone, pre-revolutionary times, there were never people with knowledge and understanding ?

Of course not!

It is possible to enumerate the names of only hundreds of prominent Russian and Russian people of the 18th, 19th and early 20th centuries, who, sitting at their desk in their office, or sheltering from the rain with a raincoat, or holding an inkwell sliding from rolling, wrote on a sheet of paper: "What to do ..." and then put a *colon*, not a question mark, because they wrote not "philosophical" treatises, but a plan for specific creative work for tomorrow.

When you start thinking about them, remembering them - both those that are heard from the school bench, and those about whom you can only learn in thick encyclopedias - it takes your breath away from this sea and the world of names!

Corresponding member of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences Pyotr Sobolevsky (1781–1842), whom Humboldt called one of the first engineers in Europe, was a chemist, metallurgist, author of world-class works on refining platinum...

Academician Herman Hess (1802–1850), just six years after the Decembrist uprising, published in Nikolaev Russia the textbook "Fundamentals of Pure Chemistry", which shaped the views of Russian chemists until the publication of Mendeleev's "Fundamentals of Chemistry".

Only two names! And they - the true lights of Russia, its true brains - in our

hundreds and thousands of stories!

Alas, which of the current "intellectuals" in the current "Rossiyanin" does not know, for example, the philosophers Berdyaev, Ilyin, Solonevich or Solovyov, and who remembers Pyotr Sobolevsky and Hermann Hess?

And how much do we know about, for example, Przhevalsky, who walked the planet no less, but more than the Englishman Livingston?

Thinking about them, so different, you are convinced that *almost from the very beginning of Peter's Europeanization there were and are two educated Russias: one who read and the other who understood. One is intellectual, and the second is intellectual. The same Vasily Klyuchevsky was an intellectual, but he was not an intellectual.*

As he was not, by the way, Alexander Sergeevich Pushkin.

I think it was precisely because of this circumstance that Alexander Pushkin managed to ruthlessly define Alexander Radishchev's delusions:

"Restless curiosity, more than a thirst for knowledge, was the hallmark of his mind. <...> He is the true representative of semi-enlightenment."

How accurate and how, alas, topical.

The Russian intelligentsia confidently considered and considers itself to be the bearer of Russian self-consciousness and the main (in some way) national value. She sincerely believes that only she is able to give Russian society a national vision of life, a national idea and...

And deeply mistaken and mistaken in that.

The bearer of Russian self-consciousness has been and will be intellectual Russia, from time immemorial engaged in the practical creation of a real Russia, and not a "cathedral" one. Another thing is that this Russia was mistaken - already in the other direction, leaving the social process at the mercy of the "intelligentsia". The old Russian intellectuals withdrew themselves from politics, becoming like their Western counterparts, but they lived in Russia, a truly special country.

I report this not only for the sake of historical truth, but also as a hint to the current Russian intellectuals from science, technology, medicine and production. After all, they also work like in the West, but they live in Russia, and it's not worth it for them to distance themselves from the social problems of Russia - otherwise the useless, self-proclaimed, smelly, polluted "brains of the nation" will deal with these problems with even more catastrophic than hitherto, the result.

The entire history of the West has allowed Western intellectuals to influence social development to the greatest extent by the very fact of their growing and successful professional activity. And therefore, Western intellectuals could well afford the luxury of locking themselves into their narrow confines without tragic consequences for the destinies of their countries.

Otherwise it turned out in tsarist Russia. Intellectual Russia could not decisively influence social development - the anti-state and anti-intellectual policy of the autocracy affected, unable to consciously and purposefully unite the creative forces of Russia on its own platform.

Only the Bolsheviks were able to fulfill the task of uniting the healthy forces of Russia, and today we, in a completely different historical situation, have the same thing as more than a hundred years ago! *The current capitalist Kremlin is also unable to unite and use the truly creative part of Russian society for the benefit of the peoples of Russia and the world. But that part still exists! And it's time for her to think about political unification.*

Around who?

I must say right away that it is around the Communist Party, renewed by the common forces, not of the Zyuganov, but of the Leninist type.

But this is a topic for a separate discussion.

So, as *today* in tsarist Russia, Russia labored on the historical stage

intellectual, playing public roles, visible to all. Until 1917, political intellectuals, that is, the Bolsheviks, did not play in the public self-consciousness of Russia the leading role that Russian intellectual circles gave to political intellectuals - all sorts of "zemstvos", "liberals", "legal Marxists" and

etc.

Today history is repeating itself.

On the one hand, today's "literary-newspaper" intellectuals claim some kind of political and spiritual leadership, some kind of independent role, without any objective grounds for this.

On the other hand, *modern intellectual Russia is still not aware of the urgent need for its political unification in the interests of the struggle for Russia, which can only survive and develop as a new Soviet Russia.*

Now the conceptual correctness of Lenin in his negative assessment of the Russian intelligentsia is becoming more and more clear. This negative assessment is important for understanding and correcting the current socio-political situation.

Before the revolution, Russian intellectuals enthusiastically called for revolution and unanimously scolded the "rotten autocracy", not realizing that society is rotting not like a dead log in the forest, but like a living organism! Therefore, a real revolution, and even in Russia, could only be such as it turned out to be in 1917. *The organism rotted like a living being, and it accumulated not a cold element of irreversible decay (as in a rotten stump), but the pus of an abscess that infects the body, the breakthrough of which cleanses the inflamed organism, but inevitably floods the body not with oil, but with a foul-smelling substance.*

After all, then, in 1917, something broke through that had accumulated *for centuries* in the depths of the unjustly, undeservedly suffering and at the same time undeveloped, ignorant majority of the people.

The Russian intelligentsia in its "Doctor Zhivagovsky" guise is the interests of Russia and betrayed the people. And betrayed squeamishly.

What should a compassionate educated person do when he finds himself next to a sick person with outgoing pus, especially if this sick person is a creature close to him? That's right: you need to wipe the pus, not forgetting about sanitation and antiseptics; you need to prepare clean bandages and turundas, you need to take care of injections, about drinking that reduces fever. To bother, wash, clean, sometimes - despite the injustice and whims of a feverish patient, and so on.

In the situation of 1917 and later, the educated stratum was required to be calmly prepared for daily, unpleasant and often dirty social work. The Russian intelligentsia turned out to be unprepared and incapable for it. She not only moved away in disgust, but began to throw dirt and spit into these purulent, opened wounds of the Motherland.

As a result, the small Leninist, educated element of Bolshevism, in alliance with the spontaneously popular, Kovpak-Chapaev-Budyonnovist, mass element, had to fight everything at once: the collapse of the world war, let's forget!) exploiters, including the Russian intelligentsia.

What is there to be surprised that firewood was broken in excess at the same time ?!

Let me remind you that Lenin was not mistaken about the fact that under the thinnest layer of educated Bolshevism there is a dark, uncontrollable and sinister force of the people's ignorant and destructive passion.

Not opponents of Leninism, but *slanderers* of it, today stick out the modest figure of Pasternak's "hero" - Doctor Zhivago, and expel much more significant heroes of Alexei Tolstoy - officer Roshchin, engineer Telegin from the memory of living generations.

Lenin's strength was in the precise formulation of questions. Let us put the exact questions:

"Who is to blame for the fact that the Potemkin sailors were cooked borscht from meat with worms? Who built the Kshesinskaya Palace for the ballerina "Malechka" and filled it with diamond sets at the very time when the peasant kids were tending geese? Who frowned with displeasure if the temperature of the Clicquot served at his table differed by a couple of degrees from the prescribed one, and at the same time calmly reacted to the fact that the workers at the Lena gold mine were brought to the butcher's shop to sell bull genitals ' ?

The answer is obvious - the ruling class of Russia is guilty.

He was guilty of the poverty of two-thirds of the people then, he is guilty of the poverty of two-thirds of the people now. *The old ruling class pursued a policy of violence against its own people not for a year, not ten, but for a good two hundred years!* Too impudently, the propertied minority trampled on and did not recognize the rights of the majority! And when the people demanded them - yes, rudely, ignorantly, clumsily - instead of bowing before his will and rights, the propertied class began to prepare a civil war.

And untied her.

Lenin did not want it. He did not need a civil war, his goal was creation. A minority needed a war, because in the conditions of bloody turmoil and foreign intervention, it could have a chance to maintain flagrant social inequality!

It is this former wealthy minority that opened the way to violence, coloring the era blood unnecessary neither to the people, nor to Lenin.

However, despite the fact that the responsibility for the civil war lies with the former propertied sections of the population of Russia, one of the main culprits of the fact that Lenin and the Bolsheviks were forced from the very beginning not to develop a new society, but to defend it with a fight against the encroachment of the overthrown possessing minority, turned out to be the Russian intelligentsia.

In the era of the then Russian Troubles, for the most part, she was not on the side of Russia and the people. In the "epoch" of the current "Russian" Mutiny, the picture is repeated - the predominant part of the "elite intelligentsia" betrays Russia and the people.

The opponent of Lenin, Konstantin Pobedonostsev, has the following definition of it:

"The intelligentsia is a part of Russian society that enthusiastically perceives any idea, any fact, even a rumor aimed at discrediting state power; she is indifferent to everything else in the life of the country.

Lenin, too, probably could have subscribed to these words. Because the same privatdozentov, officials, journalists who excitedly scolded the "rotten autocracy", then just as excitedly sabotaged the new workers' and peasants' power.

It was they, the Russian educated and semi-educated strata, who created that nutrient medium in which the bacillus of civil war and intervention developed, and then choked in lines on the steamships leaving for Constantinople.

Even today, having forgotten about their folk roots, they almost completely justify the long-standing characterization of Pobedonostsev, with the only difference being that now they are not exposing the current Kremlin, which has discredited itself, but are trying to justify it.

Now they instantly perceive every idea, every fact, and especially every rumor aimed at discrediting the exclusively *socialist* state power, and spread these rumors themselves. They slander the Soviet government, while remaining indifferent, as they were a century ago, to the true needs of the Fatherland.

The philosopher Konstantin Leontiev himself is far from being a model of efficiency and faithfulness. understanding of life - recognized:

"The Russian intelligentsia is empty, negative, unprincipled. Moreover, it is not very national precisely where it should be national ... The Russian intelligentsia has been created

so that the farther it is, the more colorless ... "

This was said about the then "educated", about the semi-intellectuals, although to no small extent it was also a self-assessment of that educated, refined layer to which Leontiev himself belonged. However, it is impossible not to admire - it was said more than a hundred years ago, but it is said as it is today!

A little later, in 1909, in the famous collection of articles about the Russian intelligentsia "Milestones"

Pyotr Berngardovich Struve (1870–1944), the same age as Lenin, a bourgeois economist and philosopher, a "legal Marxist" and a Cadet at the same time, and after October 1917 a white émigré, wrote something similar:

"The ideological form of the Russian intelligentsia is its *estrangement*, its alienation from the state and hostility towards it.

Struve had one thing in mind, but, without knowing it himself, he got into the painful point of the pre-revolutionary intelligentsia, anticipating his own human and political fate. I cited his words because they are true even today, but with one fundamental amendment: the ideological form of the current "Russian intelligentsia" is still splitting and its alienation, but now alienation is not from the state, but from the people, as *well* as hostility towards the people.

As for the "Russian" state, the current "Kremlin-Yeltsin" the state and the "Russian intellectuals" are twin brothers.

Why, even in tsarist Russia, this was very typical for the "refined" part of the "intelligentsia" – no matter what Fröndler clothes they dressed up in. In 1905, the then famous "God-seeker" Dmitry Merezhkovsky - a prosperous native of the court bureaucratic environment - published an article "The Coming boor" in the journal "Polar Star". In it, he contrasted the "spiritual nobility" of the intelligentsia with the "spiritual slavery" of philistinism and called three faces of "boor": the treasury of autocracy, the conformism of official Orthodoxy, and "rudeness coming from below."

Merezhkovsky, the son of the court clerk and husband of Zinaida Gippius, the daughter of the capital's police chief, saw the last "boor" in the emerging Bolshevism, considered him the most dangerous and wrote in 1905: "Nothing will arise from the ruins and conflagrations, except for the Coming Ham."

The current spiritual heirs of Merezhkovsky - like him boorishly convinced of their right to be the "conscience of the nation" and denying this right to the "common people" - just like this aesthetic gentleman, look at the people who raised them arrogantly. And at the same time, they assure in the most impudent way that the main channel of the current world "development" is de "unanimity, mutual assistance, mutual respect and community of interests."

How did they run away!

This is about a world where a thousand billionaires tower over billions living on two or three dollars a day (that's how half the world's population lives). About a world where the gendarmerie actions of the UN, NATO and the USA, such as the bombing of Libya, are becoming the norm!

The games of "revolution" provoked in the Middle East by the West in the early spring of 2011 cost, for example, Egypt \$20 billion by the end of spring 2011. The country is in crisis, food is becoming more expensive, and the standard way out is suggested to it - seek "help" from the International Monetary Fund. And the IMF, which organized the crisis in Egypt, will provide it - of course, for reasons of "unanimity, mutual assistance, mutual respect and community of interests" - a bonded loan of 20 billion dollars.

Deftly? Alas, yes ... However, such incidents occurring in the modern world are not

reduce the admiration of "Russian intellectuals" for the "advantages" of "developed countries".

The pre-revolutionary "racist" semi-intelligentsia selflessly looked back at the West - not in order to learn the business, but in order to, with dripping saliva, envy and admire them.

The current "Russian-Russian intelligentsia" also found its external Western "ideal", and at the same time - and internal power to their liking, shoulder and intellect. This "spiritual" kinship between the Kremlin and the "intelligent" "elite" is expressed today in many ways and has already become a phenomenon.

The "elite" "intelligentsia" in the Soviet, and then - in the post-Soviet times, actively participated in the process of stealing Russia from its peoples. Of course, the "creative Russian intelligentsia" - socially cowardly and in a business sense mediocre - could not take part in the bacchanalia of direct enrichment due to the "privatization" of the people's property. On the other hand, the "intelligentsia" was always ready to stand "on the lookout", look for "lost Russia" and "long-lost truths" under the "lantern of modernity" ...

She called: "Come and see!", "More light!", And most importantly, she yelled: "Stop the thief!", Assuring the public that the thieves, they say, are Lenin, Stalin and the Bolsheviks, and by no means "foremen of treason", not Gorbachev, not Yeltsin and other privatization anti-heroes of our Time of Troubles.

But Russia - not once there and by someone there "lost", but real, still powerful, but poisoned by the dope of "perestroika" - in the meantime, they stole, stole, stole.

And they stole it.

They stole together with the mother of Russian cities the capital city of Kiev. And instead great, united and indivisible Soviet Russia slipped the peoples of "Russia" in quotation marks.

That is why for me personally, for more than twenty years, the word "intelligentsia" became - in a sense - a dirty word, almost obscene.

However, I'm not the only one who doesn't like this audience - not only Pobedonostsev and Lenin treated it with no more respect, but also, for example, Konstantin, Lev and Alexei Tolstoy or, here, the American artist Rockwell Kent. He always attracted me not only with the originality of his talent, but also with his ironic honesty towards life and towards himself, which is not very characteristic of people of art. In his autobiographical book *It's Me, Lord!* Kent wrote:

"As for the apostasy... of the intelligentsia, I have not yet found a satisfactory explanation for this phenomenon. I am inclined to think that some psychological factor is hidden here, therefore the behavior of intellectuals cannot in many cases be easily explained by petty prudence...

However, no one will deny that there are people who are sold. Whether these traitors will be rewarded with oats in the informant's stable, or, if they are more gifted, well-paid posts on the editorial board of the Reader's Digest, depends on their market value.

All this is fully applicable both to many Soviet "intellectuals" and to "Russian" "intellectuals". They often spit and spit on their homeland and its past simply out of love for art - not high Art, but petty "art" to live in constant spiritual dirty tricks.

Enough, of course, and those that are sold. But hardly any of them can count on well-paid positions in the editorial office of the Reader's Digest magazine. More than the magazine "Spark" they can not pull.

As for the typical behavior of an intellectual, his frequent psychological mystery, which occupied Kent, is characteristic not only of our times. *The Russian "intellectual" always knew for sure that his general line was to get confused in three pines and*

while leading as many other fellow citizens as possible.

That's why my hand reaches for the rod every time the conversation turns to the "Russian intelligentsia".

But it is only one of the three sources and three components of the death of the USSR. Lie intelligentsia and the betrayal of the "elite" - the first source.

The social stupidity of the people deceived by the intelligentsia and betrayed "elite" - the second source.

The third source...

Well, I will also talk about him - a little later in the following chapters, but now I invite reader in August 1991 - *that same* August.

Chapter 3

August 22, 1991 (morning): along the K bus route

Until August 1991, June 22, 1941 was considered the blackest day in Soviet history (then there was another June 22, but more on that later). Then the country had a very hard time, and even Stalin, on one of the first days of the war, could not restrain his feelings and, according to the memoirs of Anastas Mikoyan, said in his inner circle: "Lenin left us a great legacy, and we, his heirs, missed all this ... did it."

I think that Mikoyan didn't invent almost anything here - he most likely lied about one thing, claiming that Stalin said this almost on the first day of the war. And this was said for sure at the end of the first week - after the surrender of Minsk, after the scale of the failure of those on whom both he and Russia relied became clear to Stalin.

But then Russia had Stalin, there were his associates, there was a mass layer of enthusiasts - builders of the socialist Power, and they then defended Russia.

Did anyone think in the May days of 1945 that half a century after June 22, 1941, the new generations of citizens of the USSR mediocres, for "healthy lives" will miss the great legacy of the Stalin era, will throw the results of the great military and labor efforts of the people down the drain? However, on August 22, 1991, the impossible became a fact.

The memories of those days are still quite fresh for me today ... They are remembered - one way or another - and tens of millions of my fellow citizens who lived then. However, they do not interfere with something to remind. Moreover, today new generations have come into life who do not remember 1991 or remembering him badly.

Therefore, I will immediately inform you that on August 19, 1991 in the USSR, for the first time in its post-war history, a state of emergency was declared and the so-called State Committee for the State of Emergency - the GKChP was formed. It included Vice-President of the USSR G. Yanaev, Prime Minister V. Pavlov, Minister of Defense Marshal D. Yazov, Chairman of the KGB V. Kryuchkov, Minister of Internal Affairs B. Pugo, First Deputy Chairman of the Defense Council O. Baklanov, Chairman of the Krestyansky Union V. Starodubtsev and Chairman of the Association of State Enterprises A. Tizyakov.

It was announced that President Gorbachev was unable to perform his functions due to health reasons and his duties were temporarily transferred to Vice President Yanaev. Troops were sent to Moscow by order of Marshal Yazov.

But on the same day, tanks and a battalion of paratroopers arrived at the Yeltsin White House, sent there in violation of the oath, that is, treacherously, by the commander of the Airborne Forces, General P. Grachev, the future Pasha Mercedes.

All this happened on the eve of the supposed signing of a new Union Treaty, "developed" in such a way that it was, in fact, a project for the funeral of the USSR. And in fact, the GKChP was the last attempt by a relatively honest part of the top Soviet leadership to save the USSR and keep the country from disaster.

However, the country was deliberately led "into the dressing". On August 20 and 21, rallies were held in Moscow - outwardly almost spontaneous, but in fact - very good

organized. On the night of August 20-21, three demonstrators died under extremely strange circumstances. Moscow looked more and more like a dacha set free by Kanatchikov. Five years ago, no one could have imagined something like this even in a nightmare. Except...

Except, of course, those who conceived all this much earlier than five years ago. We will talk about this later - in chapter five -.

The formation of the GKChP was preceded by five years of "perestroika", later aptly named "catastroyka". You can't say more precisely - the country was completely, I repeat, deliberately led to a catastrophe, and by the summer of 1991 it had almost become a fact. On June 12, the election of the President of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic was held, and Boris Yeltsin became the President by a huge margin. The Soviet people themselves chose the future executioner of Soviet power.

And the year 1991 began with the fact that on January 13th (well, quite by chance on January 13th) in Vilnius, the storming of the Vilnius television tower by a protesting crowd was provoked. Blood spilled...

"Vilnius-91" became a deliberate forerunner of "Moscow-91" - after all, by that time all the highest state structures in Moscow and the capitals of the Union republics were stuffed with provocateurs as thickly as Filippov's cod - with raisins.

The GKChP was no exception. Even in it itself, one of the leading roles was played by such a dubious person as the chairman of the KGB "Andropovite" Kryuchkov. So, as this "Chekist No. 1" "acted" in those troubled days, either an impenetrable fool or a cunning scoundrel could act. Adherents of Kryuchkov can choose any option, but, as the ancient Romans used to say, "tertium non datur" - "there is no third."

Gorbachev at that time was in the Crimea, in Foros. The very existence of the USSR was already being called into question, in the union republics the most vile kind of nationalism ruled the ball, and Gorbachev "rested" in the south. All this, of course, was sewn with white thread, but here - it would seem that quite serious people, members of the State Emergency Committee - far from being children, allowed themselves to be fooled like children and became whipping boys.

The Minister of the Interior, Pugo, behaved especially strangely - he was neither a fool nor a provocateur. However, it is unlikely that the Moscow forces of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs would have obeyed Pugo then - stupefaction in Moscow was almost universal.

In the meantime, Boris Yeltsin became the real (more precisely, visible, in plain sight) master of Moscow - with the "live" GKChP. On the night of August 21-22, Gorbachev returned to Moscow, but withdrew from control of the situation - which in itself, given his position as President of the USSR, was actually a state crime.

However, then everything that happened in the capital of the USSR and in the capitals of the Union republics, was a state crime.

Gorbachev arrived in Moscow at night, and in the early morning of August 22, 1991, I arrived at Moscow by train from the "nuclear" "Arzamas-16" (now - Sarov, Nizhny Novgorod region).

They say it's better to see once than hear a hundred times. Well, already on the very first day in Moscow I saw and heard a lot of things that additionally clarified the already rapidly clearing (if you look with open eyes) situation.

Below I will give a number of sketches of those days and I hope that they will be interesting and useful to the reader - after all, from the whole multitude of impressions of that time, I have selected the most significant ones for the book. These were those "drops" that reflected the entire Soviet Union of the 1991 model, which had been stirred up out of the blue.

I wanted to get to Moscow the very next day after the formation of the State Emergency Committee - I really wanted to give someone some advice. The way its members behaved made me remember obscene, alas, vocabulary - television channels were filled with scenes from Swan Lake, other classics, *and that's it*.

It was clear that the GKChP did not have clear goals and was not ready to set them for the people. Accordingly, reasonable doubts arose that this would end in something worthwhile.

Nevertheless, since I already had some acquaintances in the capital, I decided to go, taking a vacation for three days at my own expense.

The chief director of the Lenin Komsomol Theater Mark Zakharov was preparing publicly - in front of a TV camera - to burn his party card, and I, permanently non-party, came before that trip to the city committee of the CPSU "Arzamas-16" and met his first secretary.

In the Gorky region there were two Ivans, the first secretaries of city committees. Ivan Sklyarov was the first secretary in the city committee of the real Arzamas, and Ivan Nikitchuk was in the city committee of "Arzamas-16" (in fact, the last city committee was called "Kremlin" in party documents from the 50s, according to the closed name of "Arzamas-16" - the Kremlin) .

Ivan Sklyarov turned out to be a renegade and immediately defected to Yeltsin's "boy" Boris Nemtsov as vice-governor.

Ivan Nikitchuk remained a communist and suffered grief in the first "Yeltsin" days - just missed the prison.

Later, we had to eat together more than one pood of salt (by 2011, such an account of the prescription of our acquaintance had exceeded a pood by the fourth), and then we just got to know each other. As a result, I left for Moscow on a business trip from the city committee (however, they did not manage to give me an advance, and upon my return there was no one to pay for the trip).

When I was getting ready for the train, Moscow suddenly began to broadcast instead of Mussorgsky's music the speech of Ruslan Khasbulatov, Yeltsin's chairman (or traitor?) of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR. It became clear that a catastrophe had erupted. However, I still left for Moscow.

But he hid the ticket of the city committee in a bag so that it was not easy to find it.

Yes, *somehow immediately there was a feeling that my country is no longer mine*. I was driving and would not be surprised if in Moscow at the Kazansky railway station I saw some strange patrols in foreign uniforms conducting searches, etc. However, outwardly, upon arrival, everything looked the same as always, except that there were fewer people at the station than usual. And I went to our departmental "Sredmash" hotel - to try my luck in getting a roof over my head.

The road was familiar for a long time: from the Komsomolskaya metro station to the Kirovskaya metro station, then - by tram to the Ustyinsky bridge on the Gorky embankment (now it has been renamed either Starovetushnaya, or Novo-smelly, or something like that) ... And here I am - in an unusually empty hotel lobby. There were almost no seconded, so getting a place was not a problem.

Having settled down, I went out into the street, and then the question arose before me - where to move and how? No patrols or military equipment could be seen from the window of the tram, but how was it in the center, on Red Square?

However, I immediately remembered that nearby, on Polina Osipenko Street (now it is also somehow renamed), there is a bus stop "K" - a ring route passing by the Museum of V. I. Lenin and the State Planning Committee of the USSR, next to Red Square .

Well, if the route is valid, it will be possible to assess the situation without leaving bus, and if necessary, return to where you started the trip. And then we'll see.

Soon I was rolling along the embankment along the Kremlin wall. The streets at seven in the morning were still deserted, only an unsightly little man was walking along the Moskva River, in appearance - an ordinary Moscow "hegemon" in a white shirt with rolled up sleeves and black tattered trousers.

He stood out because he was the only one. And suddenly this little man pulled out of pocket ... a walkie-talkie, pulled out a telescopic antenna and began to say something.

This seemingly small detail was my first, but far from my last shock on that Moscow day on August 22, 1991. I understood that in post-Gekashesh Moscow, *my own* would not have gone like that. And if not so long ago everyone around was one way or another one's own, now it seems that one had to learn to divide those around into one's own *and others*'.

In those days in Moscow, when sinister forces were ruining the Soviet Union, I more than once observed on the streets of Moscow similar, outwardly gray, little men of both sexes who - sometimes secretly, and sometimes openly - they slandered something into the same portable radios in the middle of crowds of people. Who were they, what special services or funds did they represent, one can only guess.

However, even this is not so important today. The important thing is that they were and acted, and they acted against the USSR.

Bus route "K" was already approaching the Manege. There were enough people on the streets here, and I, leaving at the Lenin Museum, began my tour of Moscow ...

The second strong impression of that day was the excellently published book by the famous pediatrician Benjamin Spock, exhibited in the window of a newsstand on Gorky Street (former and future Tverskaya) near Glavtelegraph at a completely state-owned price of 5 rubles. It was almost impossible to buy Spock freely, they were speculating, but here ... The first impulse was, of course, to buy, but for some reason it became disgusting. I realized that the seller put the book out the day before, *at the State Emergency Committee*. He put up, as they say, with a fright, not yet knowing how things would turn out. And in the morning I did not have time to understand that it was already *possible again* ...

It should be noted that I was not mistaken - passing by the same kiosk in the afternoon, I saw a new price tag on the same Spock: "12 rubles". It was once again allowed to do one's own little "business" in Moscow.

I walked around Moscow ... Gorky's street was still crowded, the day promised to be sunny, but I walked as if under the black canopy of something sinister, *not my own*.

And this feeling did not disappear.

However, *something really* hovered over Moscow in those days. One of those days I popped into a dumpling shop for a quick bite to eat and was amazed at what I heard from a muffled transistor on the wall. From there came a monotonous, mumbling speech, but it was not a transmission from some Islamic radio station, but simply gibberish in an unknown "bird" language. Most likely, Muscovites then first practiced what later became known as NLP - Neuro-Linguistic Programming.

Here is Pushkin Square, the bronze Pushkin, with his head reproachfully bowed, watching his unreasonable descendants. In the showcase of the Izvestia building, masterfully executed posters are exhibited in the manner of the old "ROSTA windows" or "TASS windows" - posters of the revolutionary and military era on topical issues.

The posters were made by the confident hand of a professional and viciously mocked the overthrown GKChP.

It all looked vile, but the poster dedicated to Pugo. It could be understood from it that Pugo was killed, because the poster had the lines:

"I scored a charge
In the carcass of Pugo.

This disgusting, but also professionally made pun evoked a feeling of both physical disgust and hopelessness. There was a feeling of unreality of what was happening, although intellectually I was ready for something like that. Psychologically or...

By the way, the current biographical dictionaries claim that Pugo and his wife allegedly committed suicide, and even cite his alleged suicide note. However, Pugo - I have no doubt about that - was killed, and his killers on the first day of their triumph did not hide the vile, unpunished joy from this. In the rhyme on the poster in the window of Izvestia, they rashly blurted out too much, and only then they realized that they had blabbed out, and they "worked" back to the version of suicide.

After a series of years, Pugo may seem old, but he was only 54 years old in the year of his death. Of all the members of the GKChP, he was the only one who could, in troubled times

the subsequent collapse of Yeltsin to become the center of association for the struggle for the new Soviet Union, and thus was especially dangerous for the Yeltsin putschists. Therefore, presumably, Pugo, the only member of the GKChP, was immediately removed from the situation physically, crudely disguising the murder as a suicide.

The day was flaring up, the streets were getting crowded, but it was clear that they were just ordinary Muscovites or even non-residents who accidentally ended up in the capital and unconsciously headed to its center for at least some information. No one showed much joy, although there were no sad faces either. In some, however, there was a hint of alertness and even bruisedness.

It was too early to call someone, and I just walked around Moscow alone with my thoughts and feelings. So far, one thing has been clear: at least for a while, those unhealthy forces that have "rocked the boat" and led the country to collapse have gained the upper hand. But I did not believe that it would be for a long time.

I believed in something else: now all the healthy forces of the country should understand what needs to be done! It is time to use all the considerable forces of the State in order to overthrow the sinister anti-state forces. After all, the highest generals, the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, the heads of economic sectors, the directors of leading state enterprises, their teams, leading masters of culture should come out - at least now - in support of the USSR ... Now the cards are open!

So I thought, so I wanted to think, but something ominous covered the sunny Moscow day more and more firmly, and although my heart believed in the best, my mind already guessed - today the countdown of another time has begun - not historical, but anti-historical.

And all my further movements that day more and more convinced, alas, of the last one.

However, I will continue...

Chapter 4

August 22, 1991 (day): "MAI students for freedom"

The day of August 22 unfolded in all its variegation, and I walked or rode from one point to another, but I did not find a readiness to act and counteract anywhere.

I visited several places that day and spoke with various people, in particular in some of the Moscow editorial offices. As already mentioned, I then began to "acquire" a number of acquaintances, just in the August issue of the magazine of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs "International Life" my article "The Firebird of Sergei Diaghilev" was published. Well, as they say, the testicle turned out to be expensive, but not by the day of Christ, but by the devil.

I also visited the editorial office of Literaturnaya Gazeta ... In a mansion, comfortably located in Kostyansky Lane, one of my "literary and newspaper" acquaintances - then a very famous journalist, whose name I will not mention for a number of reasons - met me in a state of such euphoria that I was taken aback. Then the smile changed into a slight grimace, and the acquaintance admitted that his head ached, since Burlatsky (the then editor-in-chief) supposedly put out a case of cognac at the expense of the editorial staff and everyone calmed down only in the morning. However, when I went to another acquaintance, I did not find much joy in him about what was happening, but from him I first heard the word "Yeltsinoids", which later became commonly used.

The third acquaintance was joyful and from the threshold told me: "You know, they say that Iron Felix is being rolled on the Lubyanka!"

I felt disgusted. Having dryly said goodbye, I left the "literary" mansion and walked to the metro station "Kirovskaya" (future "Chistye Prudy"). Leaving five minutes later at the station - so far "Dzerzhinskaya", I hardly resisted a purely physical urge to vomit.

Dzerzhinsky Square (former and future Lubyanskaya Square) was surrounded by a silent crowd crowding around a portable fence put up by someone along the entire perimeter of the square. And in the center of the square, the architectural dominant of which for decades was

a taut figure of the first knight of the revolution in a long gray overcoat, at an empty pedestal, generously flooded with buckets of red paint, a gang of thugs raged (another word didn't fit here).

The police were nowhere to be seen, but between the silent crowd and the yelling gang, waving tricolors, lay a huge empty ring. And no one from the crowd crossed it to join the "triumphants".

Only now, recalling those days, it occurred to me that this picture, vividly imprinted in my memory, was symbolic for the whole of August 1991, for the entire country that was then immense.

In the center of events, a bunch of provocateurs and provoked hooligan "intelligent" *idiots* ruled *the permitted and sanctioned* coven, and the masses, sold out by the "elite" and deceived by "thinkers", remained silent. At the same time, on August 22, 1991, between a handful of scoundrels who received rights and the future disenfranchised masses, an impassable alienation zone lay.

The people, on the other hand, remained silent because during the last five years they had been weaned from loving Soviet power. It was the bodies of this power themselves, headed by Gorbachev's Central Committee of the CPSU, who weaned.

Yes, August 22, 1991 was a busy day. There were few joyful faces on the streets, but on the whole Moscow - with the exception of the centers of the artificial excitement stirred up by Yeltsin's putschists - looked calm. People simply did not understand that soon their lives would begin to be seriously broken.

That day, walking along the Old Arbat, I caught a glimpse of a conversation between two uninhibited-looking young sellers of matryoshka dolls painted "like Lenin", "like Stalin", "like Gorbachev", "like Yeltsin", etc.

"Looks like it's gone," one said loudly.

"Yeah," agreed the other. - And I thought the Arbat would be covered ...

Well, they weren't wrong. The Arbat was not "covered up", it has just flourished and is flourishing.

Covered the State.

And now on the Old Arbat they sell its awards, the uniform of its soldiers, helmets from high-altitude compensation suits, and even the costumes of the former defenders of its air lines themselves.

Then, on August 22, I ended up on Novy Arbat - on Kalinin Avenue at the time. Past the slender buildings - "books" flowed and flowed a many-sided crowd - "snake", in the head of which Yeltsin himself walked with the company. In the same place, in front, they were carrying three coffins with those who "died for freedom", who were mockingly awarded - posthumously - the titles of Heroes of the Soviet Union. (Much later, there were muffled echoes of talk that the drug-smoked "heroes" seemed to have simply been thrown under armored personnel carriers - to give the performance an appropriate bloody color.)

I stood on the sidewalk, and tens, if not hundreds of thousands of "demonstrators" flowed past me and flowed - on a weekday. From the side they were accompanied by shadows in civilian clothes with walkie-talkies. One of them - female - looked like she had just arrived from Tel Aviv.

Balloons, Vlasov's "tricolors" and banners waved over the flowing crowd. I remember one - in white letters on a blue field: "MAI students - for freedom!" For me, who graduated from KhAI - Kharkov Aviation Institute - it was especially unpleasant.

Late in the evening, I reached another of my Moscow acquaintances, a very prominent diplomat. He sat alone in the office, looking unhappy.

When we settled into our chairs, he asked bluntly:

- How do you assess what is happening?

I already had a completely unambiguous opinion on this matter, but I hesitated. I was going to answer as I thought, but at the same time the thought flashed: "I'll tell you now, and in response I'll hear that if so, then our paths, dear friend, from now on diverge." And lose it

Acquaintance was not desirable from any point of view.

My interlocutor was an experienced man, he worked a lot in our embassies on all over the world, had the rank of adviser 1st class, and understanding my hesitation, he suggested:

Let me say first, and you will agree or disagree.

When I nodded he said:

- Transnational corporations have come to power in the country.

And although there was nothing funny in such a statement, I blurted out with relief:

- Yes!

That conversation established our relationship for many years to come. We then consoled each other for a long time, and I was, as it turned out, too optimistic, and he, as it turned out, was still more pessimistic than he should have been. After all, the cause of the USSR is still not lost!

But the statement that was made in one of the Moscow offices on August 22, 1991, retains all its correctness to this day: at that time, external forces alien to the peoples of the USSR came to power in Russia, acting in the interests of the transnational private property "elite".

At the end of Chapter 2, I wrote (and the August days of 1991, which I spent in Moscow, confirmed this once again) that the first of the three sources and three components of the death of the USSR was the lie of the intelligentsia and the betrayal of the "elite".

Social stupidity of the people, deceived by the intelligentsia and betrayed by the "elite", became the second source of the death of the USSR.

The third source of the death of the USSR was precisely it - the world's Golden "elite". She not only wanted the death of the USSR, she not only led the cause to the death of the USSR, but could not do otherwise from a very, very long time ago.

Briefly, we can say this... The USSR was born by the ideas of Marx and Engels, the ideas of socialism. However, the final triumph of these ideas meant the death of the world's privately owned "elite". Therefore, ensuring the death of the USSR has long been a matter of life or death for the "elite" - political, of course.

This is a brief thesis, but it is time to talk about it in more detail. After all, it is possible to understand the whole essence of this or that process in all its nuances only when we trace the process *to its origins*. And this is not only interesting, it is vital for the cause of the revival of the USSR.

Chapter 5

Kill before birth...

So, the death of the USSR had many reasons, and not a single objective one. Objectively, the USSR was a healthy organism, but weakened both by conscious subversive work and by its own unreasonable behavior. All that the peoples of the USSR needed for a comfortable life was to take up their minds when there was an undoubted need for it. After all, even a healthy, but weakened body can easily catch an already deadly disease.

The USSR picked up such a disease, or rather, it was deliberately infected with it, and one of the reasons for the malicious actions of the outside world was the very fact of the existence of the USSR. And in a sense, the processes that destroyed the USSR had as their starting point the same idea that the USSR gave birth to and which is capable of reviving it again.

This idea is Marxist, communist.

I am not joking and I am not trying to fool the reader - I am quite serious and, of course, I will substantiate my thought. There is no paradox in my statement, but there is only the inevitable dialectic of being with its unity and struggle of opposites. And you can specify the exact chronological mark of the beginning of the process, which at the same time laid both the systemic basis for the *inevitable* emergence of the USSR, and the systemic basis for its *possible* death. This is February 1848.

It was then that a small book came out in London as a separate edition, which had an impact on

further development of the world an influence comparable only to the influence of the Bible. I mean, of course, the Communist Manifesto.

I repeat: speaking about the fact that the appearance of the "Manifesto ..." became in a sense starting point for the plan to kill the USSR, I am quite serious.

Already in The Communist Manifesto it was rightly said that Capital gives rise to proletarians, that is, personally free wage-workers who sell their labor power to the capitalist, for which the capitalist pays only partially. But at the same time, as Marx and Engels noted, Capital gives rise to the proletariat not only as a source of its own enrichment, but also as its own gravedigger.

Alas, the founders of Marxism forgot to warn the proletarians that a stick always has two ends, and a weapon can shoot in both directions - depending on whose hands it is in.

So it happened with the idea of the proletariat as the future grave-digger of Capital. Could she please Capital? And could Capital not think about how to make it so that Capital itself could become the gravedigger of this idea, disastrous for Capital?

The Communists threw out a great call to the world: "Proletarians of all countries, unite!" But the bourgeois have also read it. The unification of the proletarian class, that is, the working people, meant the departure from the historical arena of the bourgeois class, that is, idle owners. Therefore, the bourgeois could not but come to the idea that now, after the appearance of the great call of Marx in the world, the bourgeois must also unite in *their* struggle to *divide* the working people.

After all, the systematically correct thesis about the proletariat as the future grave-digger of Capital was publicly expressed by Marx. And it was expressed in an era when Capital had already gained strength and power, and the proletarians were oppressed, disunited and poorly, if not not at all, educated.

And the proletarians did not have much time to assimilate general ideas.

The bourgeois, unlike the proletarians, were developed, educated, were accustomed to logical thinking, and they had enough time to think.

Therefore, the whole fatality for Capital of the idea of uniting the working people in the name of replacing capitalism with socialism should have been understood sooner and more deeply by Capital than by the proletariat. And having understood, Capital could not but begin to act, or rather, to oppose the ideas of Marxism.

Action always gives rise to reaction. Therefore, the action of Marx's ideas *immediately* gave rise to opposition from Capital. The task of Capital was to kill the new system even before its birth. And could it be otherwise? As soon as an idea arose in the world, the logical result of the development of which was to become a state like the USSR, the world could not but arise - at the same time - a counteridea hostile to the first idea, the logical result of the development of which should have been either preventing the emergence of such a state, or its destruction in the event that it did occur.

The ideas of Marxism were addressed to the working majority, therefore they were public and widely publicized.

The "elitist" ideas, opposing themselves to Marxism, were addressed to a parasitic or semi-parasitic proprietary minority, were hostile to the peoples and therefore were carefully hidden from the masses and never made public.

Marxism acted openly in society, and the world capitalist "elite" began to oppose Marxism secretly.

This secret, confidential activity of Capital against Labor began already in the middle of the 19th century, continues to this day and will continue until either Labor establishes world socialism on the planet, or Capital turns the planet into a garbage dump, on which humanity quickly and completely rot.

Yes, looking at things objectively, one can easily see that the ideas of Marx and Engels for world capital and for the privately owned "elite" *immediately* became deadly dangerous - in the full and precise sense of the word. After all, the "Manifesto ..." did not contain beautiful-hearted utopian projects, but clear thoughts, the essence of which boiled down to

the fact that working people must understand a simple thing: if all the material wealth of mankind is produced by working people, then they should also belong only to working people. *The right of private property, proclaimed "sacred" by Capital, actually contradicts the fundamental and inalienable human rights.*

It has been shown that private property is an instrument of appropriation by one person part of the labor of many persons and the resulting unearned income.

Already the medieval philosopher Moses ben Maimonides understood that if someone works without having property and income, then someone has income and property without laboring. Shortly before Marx, Proudhon said, as he snapped: "Property is theft." But Marx and Engels brought this idea to the level of a rigorous scientific theory. Without denying that the bourgeoisie played an "extremely revolutionary role" in history, they wrote that the productive forces in their development are becoming more and more socialized, and the relations of production remain the same, such that only the individual owner has all the rights.

Only a radical change can constructively resolve this contradiction.
political foundations of social life.

"Capital," the authors of the Manifesto wrote, "is not a personal, but a social force. Capital is a collective product and can only be set in motion by the joint activity of many members of society, and ultimately only by the joint activity of all members of society.

And then a completely logical conclusion was made:

"To be a capitalist means to occupy not only a purely personal, but also a social position in production ... Therefore, if capital is turned into collective property belonging to all members of society, then this will not be the transformation of personal property into public property. Only the social character of property will change. It will lose its class character."

Everything is right! If a shoe factory with a hundred workers and a hundred thousand pairs of shoes a year belongs to Mr. Twister, then the shoe workers receive a modest salary, and Mr. Twister a huge income, because, as the owner of the factory, he appropriates part of the labor of his workers, even *if never saw "his" factory.* With the world on a string - Twister Palace. If you appropriate only 10% of the labor of one worker, then Mr. Twister will receive 1000% compared to the average worker in his factory. And if he appropriates twenty percent for himself?

What if it's thirty?

What if it's fifty?

That's it!

But if the ownership of the Twister factory passes to its workers, then Mr. Twister will not be able to receive more than he himself earned - unless, of course, he works at the factory.

This must happen on the scale of the whole society, wrote Marx and Engels. And then luxury will disappear in the world, but poverty will also disappear. Everyone will live according to how much he has given to society. And this will mean that every honest worker will live in prosperity, and this prosperity will grow in proportion to the improvement and development of the productive forces of society.

The Manifesto also correctly indicated the way in which such a state of affairs is achieved, when capital passes from the hands of private owners into the hands of the whole society, the absolute majority of which is always the working people. The working people, wrote Marx and Engels, must unite in a *political* organization to fight not for their rights within the framework of bourgeois society, but for the replacement of one political system -

the capitalist one, where private ownership of the productive forces dominates, another system - the socialist one, where all the main productive forces and all natural wealth belong to the working people, that is, to the whole of society.

And before the appearance of the ideas of Marx and Engels, there were certain associations and organizations of workers. History knows, for example, the movement of the Luddites - the destroyers of machines, the use of which by the capitalists deprived the workers of work and earnings. The Luddite movement originated a hundred years before the first publication of the "Manifesto ..." - in the 18th century. In the same 18th century, the first trade unions of skilled workers, the trade unions, appeared in England.

In the 30s of the 19th century, in England, the first really mass, politically formed, working-class movement arose - the Chartist movement. In 1838 - ten years before the publication of the "Manifesto ..." - the Chartists set out their demands in the form of a "People's Charter" - a petition to Parliament (hence the name of the movement - from the word "charter"). However, the Chartists put forward only demands for the introduction of universal suffrage, restrictions on the working day (at that time they worked 12-14 hours), wage increases, etc., that is, in fact, *economic* demands. The Chartists appealed to the bourgeois authorities without having risen to the idea that they should simply be given a "cap".

Marx and Engels kept in touch with the left wing of the Chartists, and the idea of a Communist Manifesto was, as they say, in the air. Finally he appeared. Prior to this, as Marx wrote, philosophers only explained the world in various ways, while the essence of the matter lies in the fact that the world must be changed. Change *politically*, so that *the political*, constitutional power in society belongs not to the bourgeois, but to the working people.

At the end of the "Manifesto ..." it was said that the communists everywhere support everything a revolutionary movement directed against the existing (then capitalist) social and political order, and that in all these movements they put forward the question of property as the *main* issue of the movement. There is

The Manifesto ended with a great appeal:

"PROLETARIANS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!"

If this call were heard and correctly understood by all the working people *of all countries*, then the capitalist system that prevails throughout the world would quickly be replaced by world socialism. And if this happened, then in the new world there would be no place for idle private owners. From the ideas of the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" this followed with the iron logical immutability of the laws of nature.

But the "Manifesto ..." was only the beginning of a powerful intellectual activity Marx and Engels to develop a new scientific theory of the social process.

At the same time, as already mentioned, the Manifesto was read not only by the proletarians, but also by the capitalists. And the latter immediately understood that in order to prevent the proletarians of all countries from uniting against the capitalists of all countries, the capitalists of all countries must unite against the proletarians in order to thwart the political unification of the working people on a world scale *with political goals*.

Alas, most often it turns out that it is easier for bandits to unite for their anti-social purposes than for honest people to unite in order to eliminate bandits. And the capitalists - as a social phenomenon - by that time acquired virtually all the systemic features of the gang.

Gang members can conflict with each other, they can arrange a stabbing, but they always act together as one shoulder to shoulder in the robbery of civilians. This is how the capitalists can fight with each other for spheres of influence, for the redivision of the world, they can drown each other on the stock exchanges, but the capitalists of the whole world, after the appearance of Marx's theory in the world, have always been at the same time in counteracting the unification of the proletarians into a political force in the form Communist Party.

That is why it happened that *the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" itself*

by the fact of its appearance laid two opposite, antagonistic and mutually destroying tendencies.

One is to create a new world socialist society without private ownership of the main means of production.

The second is to preserve with all the forces and means of the old world capitalist society led by an idle fattening "elite".

The Marxists set before the working people the task of uniting.

The capitalists set themselves the task of dividing the working people.

Already the Second International, led by two renegades of Marxism, Karl Kautsky (1854–1938) and Eduard Bernstein (1850–1932), quickly became an instrument of world Capital in disintegrating the organized labor movement that had arisen.

The First International, created by Marx and Engels, was forced to cease to exist shortly after the defeat of the Paris Commune in 1871. The Second International was founded with the participation of Engels in 1889 - after the death of Marx. However, since 1895, after the death of Engels, the Second International became the patrimony of Kautsky and Bernstein, who relied on the "labor aristocracy" created by Capital. This relatively small, but still massive stratum of well-paid workers has become the backbone of Capital in dividing the entire mass of working people. Under the conditions of developing imperialism and the sweatshop exploitation of the new colonies, Capital was not sorry to share a part of the huge profits with the top layer of the proletariat and feed it. And the implementation of the old principle "Divide and rule!" was now for the capitalist "elite" the main, most important condition for its preservation.

With the help of their accomplices in the labor movement, the "elite" of the working people divided them. And it shares to this day to the extent that the working people allow it.

And they allow.

The political demands of Marx and Engels to replace the old social system with a new one Bernstein and Kautsky, the two biggest agents of Capital's influence, were gradually reduced to nothing. Bernstein put forward the slogan: "The ultimate goal is nothing, the movement is everything" - and offered the working people not a political struggle, but cooperation with the bourgeoisie to improve the economic conditions of life. The Marxist idea of social revolution was replaced by the opportunist "idea" of social reformism. All European social democratic parties - except one - led the workers away from the path outlined by Marx.

The only truly Marxist party turned out to be the party of Lenin, the party of the Bolsheviks.

This party led Russia to a new political system. This is neither the time nor the place to describe the history of the Great October Socialist Revolution, but it must be emphasized at least briefly that it would hardly have become possible if not for three important circumstances.

First: the Anglo-Saxons and the French dragged the already rotten tsarist Russia into the imperialist war, which she did not need, and thus undermined the autocracy...

Secondly, the bourgeois elite of Russia was tired of playing secondary roles in the empire of the mediocre Nicholas II, and she decided to take state power herself. It was the bourgeoisie that started the February Revolution, which was also supported by the allies, who were afraid of an emaciated Russia withdrawing from the war on the terms of a separate peace with Germany.

Third: in Russia there was a militant workers' party - the true political vanguard of the people, the RSDLP (b), and at its head was the genius of revolutionary tactics, Lenin. He managed to seize the initiative and bring the revolutionary situation, created by the bourgeoisie in February 1917 "for himself", to the socialist October.

In the Civil War and foreign intervention, the new Russia survived and began socialist construction. In December 1922, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the USSR, was formed. Pre-war subversive work of Capital against the USSR

caused him considerable damage, but on the whole had no success. The darkest fears of Capital began to come true - on one sixth of the planet a state power was established, determined to become the gravedigger of capitalism and attracting to itself all the healthy anti-capitalist forces of the world.

Capital's attempt to liquidate its potential historical gravedigger at the hands of Hitler failed, plans for the nuclear annihilation of the USSR were also thwarted by the creation of its own nuclear weapons in the Soviet Union.

And then the capitalist West set about subversive work against the USSR seriously and for a long time, taking into account all those dangers for Capital that were found in the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. You need to know the enemy - we often said this. However, Capital studied its main enemy - the Land of Soviets - much more diligently and more successfully than the Land of Soviets studied Capital. The bourgeoisie studied all our weaknesses and mistakes. And having studied, she used them against us.

In the USSR, after Stalin's death, the "study" of Marxism-Leninism acquired a dogmatic, pedantic, formal and hypocritical character. There was no talk of creative development at all.

And in the Western Sovietological centers, Marxism-Leninism was studied creatively, closely, in order to use its ideas against the very state that was created by the ideas of Marx and Engels and the activities of Lenin and Stalin.

By 1985, the long preparations for the destruction of the USSR were completed, and in March, World Capital made a move with Gorbachev. And in 1991, after six years of "catastrophe", it became possible to inflict the blow to the Land of Socialism, the possible need for which smart capitalists thought in February 1848 - immediately after reading the first edition of the "Manifesto of the Communist Party".

It would seem that the time circle with a diameter of 143 years has closed - to the relief of the world "elite". However, if everything returns "to its full circle", then all the same in a spiral. And on a new round of the historical spiral, world Labor can still become the gravedigger of Capital - if he finally reads the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" the way it should have been read already in the middle of the century before last.

Chapter 6

"Foremen of treason": from Gorbachev to Trotsky

Above, we touched on the history of the USSR not for the sake of its history, but for the sake of its future. After all, in order to have a Soviet future again, we, dear reader, need to have a good understanding of our Soviet past. It is necessary to understand - what was the strength of the USSR and why did the "Union of the indestructible free republics" collapse? And we need to see, as the immortal Kozma Prutkov recommended, "to the root."

Well, let's follow the sound advice, given that the "roots" of the death of the USSR were some. And one of the most important was the "root" of betrayal, betrayal.

Let's try to pull this "root" ...

As already mentioned, the assassination of the world's first workers' state was planned by the world "elite" even before the birth of this state.

The "elite" failed to kill him in the womb of History - the USSR was born. Attempts to poison the USSR to death with the poison of conspiracies of the 30s failed. The attempt of direct murder in the course of the Second World War started by the "elite" also failed.

Now there was only one thing left - to prepare the murder again, but this time carefully disguise it as a suicide. So it was more reliable and more accurate - so that later it would be possible to declare that the USSR fell because it could not help but fall due to its social inferiority.

Traitors are best suited to disguise murder as suicide. The English intelligence officer George Hill has an excellent definition of a traitor:

"A traitor is one who betrays people who believe him; a traitor is one who is not loyal to his country ... Whatever his rank and name, a traitor belongs to a rather vile category of humanity.

Well, that's exactly what it says, to the point.

One of the big bets was made on traitors.

Until 1991, the most famous traitor in the world was the biblical Judas Iscariot, who betrayed Christ. The name of Judas has become a household name. And in 1991, Judas, the seller of Christ, was replaced in the world ranking by Judas Mikhail Gorbachev.

However, he was only the chief of many. During the period when Gorbachev was in supreme power in the Soviet Union betrayed and sold by him, many new names surfaced on the surface of the social process, which, for the most part, no one in the USSR knew about until the end of the 80s. They called themselves "foremen of perestroika", although all of them were "foremen of treason" to one.

There is a lot to talk about all these Burbulis, Sobchaks, Gavriil Popovs, Aganbegyans, Abalkins, Shatalkins, etc. I am not inclined. But the important question is: why did they turn out to be so ...

However, not so many of them turned out to be - for the entire Soviet Union no more than two or three thousand people (and in the upper part - no more than one or two hundred). However, they suspiciously quickly turned out to be cohesive in a well-coordinated political gang. Which is what they were strong for.

How did it happen?

How did they get together?

Who rallied them?

And when?

Yes, today these questions are often answered almost by the organizers of this "rallying" themselves – there is enough "revealing" literature on this subject. However, these alleged "confessions" are in fact forced semi-confessions. The goal here is to hide how deep the roots of the betrayal that fell victim to the USSR were. After all, when they write about betrayal, they do not go deeper than the Brezhnev era.

But the roots go deeper.

Much deeper!

Gorbachev's "foremen of treason" appeared in the light of the social process as if from under the ground. But, by the way, why "as if"? It is quite possible to say that they just appeared out of the ground, because they were all "moles" of the West. They were unknown and invisible only to their fellow citizens, but they acted for a long time and were united for a long time -

West and in the interests of the West. "Foremen of treason" did not necessarily have subscriptions, code names, etc., but they had quite definite duties and tasks.

But when did *the first* "moles" appear in the USSR ? Really - right in the time of Gorbachev? Or maybe they arose in the USSR a little earlier? The curious testimony of Yuri Vlasov, a former world weightlifter record holder, dates back to the 90s. When he finished working in the KGB archives on the Chinese diaries of his father Vladimirov - they later came out under the name "Special Region of China", Vlasov was received by the chairman of the KGB Andropov. It was still the 70s, and Vlasov was amazed that Andropov advised him to be more careful in contacts with his subordinates, because "the central apparatus is heavily clogged with CIA agents."

So - "moles" arose during the Brezhnev era?

Or maybe even earlier, in the time of Khrushchev?

Or maybe...

"Are you trying to say that the "moles" were already under Stalin? Well, this is nonsense!" - I heard more than once when I started a conversation on this topic.

But *there is no doubt that the first high-ranking "moles" appeared in the USSR not even under Stalin, but immediately after the appearance of the USSR in the world.* The traces of Gorbachev take us far – to October 1917 and even further.

World Capital very quickly figured out what fate is in store for it if all the proletarians assimilate and practically implement the ideas of the Communist Manifesto. And having figured it out, Capital immediately began to conduct its counter-mines under the political struggle of the working people.

The most important stage was the clever transformation of the Marxist - at the foundation - of the Second International by Engels, the opportunist, social-compromising "International" of Bernstein and Kautsky.

These two figures, vile in their social betrayal, became the first outstanding "moles" in the labor movement. Now this is more or less understandable, but then even Lenin believed that Bernstein and Kautsky were sincerely mistaken and were acting on an ideological basis. And both of these figures of the Second International were, apparently, direct paid agents of influence of Capital.

But for some reason, no one has ever asked the following question: "If Capital turned out to be so dexterous and clever that it managed to launch successful "moles" into the circle of workers' leaders in the 19th century, then was Capital really so stupid that it didn't try to put into the circle of workers' leaders new, well-concealed "moles" in the 20th century?"

Perhaps Capital is not stupid. And, probably, he tried to launch new "moles" into business. And launched.

But who specifically?

The tsarist secret police, for example, managed to get an effective "mole" at the very top of the Socialist-Revolutionary (Socialist-Revolutionary) Party. He was the famous leader of the Socialist-Revolutionary terrorist militants Yevno Azef. Azef's main task was to prevent a possible assassination attempt on the king, and in relation to the rest - ministers and even grand dukes - the Social Revolutionaries were allowed to "frolic".

In the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party, the same Okhrana also managed to introduce the provocateur Malinovsky, who until the very exposure enjoyed the confidence of Lenin himself.

But if the not very nimble tsarist secret service turned out to be capable of such "exploits", then why not assume successful activities in this direction of a much more sophisticated world Capital? Moreover, *after the February bourgeois revolution of 1917 revealed a real threat of a sharp increase in the authority of the Bolsheviks among the masses, the need for world capital in its "moles" among the Bolshevik leadership became extremely urgent.*

After October 1917, after the formation of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic and it became clear that it would most likely survive, the question of *its man* in Lenin's "team" became for world Capital a question, without exaggeration, of life or death!

So was there a "boy" or not?

And if there was, then who?

Here I will only talk about two possible forerunners of Gorbachev's "foremen of betrayal", because *from these two figures in the Bolshevik "head" threads stretch both to our recent past and to our present.*

And that means into the future.

Without realizing how deeply the "moles" burrowed into Soviet soil in the past, we risk getting them again in the future if we restore the USSR.

The first figure on suspicion is Leon Trotsky-Bronstein. To this day, his political biography is full not so much of "white" as of "dirty" spots, and some of its pages are written in general with secret, sympathetic ink.

Trotsky was born in 1879 into a quite wealthy family of a large tenant, but already in 1896 he joined the revolutionary movement. However, back then it was not such a rare case.

After the II Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party (RSDLP)

it split into Bolshevik-Leninists and Mensheviks. Trotsky, who had begun with Lenin, joined the Mensheviks. He was a capable man, but he knew how to destroy more than to create, and to speak than to do. Already in 1905, Lenin publicly assessed Trotsky as a "windbag", and later spoke of him, for example, as follows: "poor hero of the phrase", "adventurer", "hero for an hour", "schismatic" and finally - as fortissimo - "Judas".

And here is what Lenin wrote about Trotsky in different years before the revolution: "Trotsky unites everyone who cherishes any ideological disintegration; all those who do not care about defending Marxism... Trotsky can easily... rally all the vulgarity around him" (1911).

"Trotsky never had any "physiognomy" and never has, but there are only flights, switching from liberals to Mensheviks and back..." (1912)

"Trotsky has no ideological and political certainty ... Not all that gold, what glitters ...", and later: "The obliging Trotsky is more dangerous than the enemy" (1914).

In August 1912, at a conference of liquidators in Vienna, Trotsky created the anti-Bolshevik August bloc, and in November 1913, under the banner of the struggle for the "unity of the RSDLP", in fact, a centrist "inter-district" organization, which included Volodarsky, Ioffe, Lunacharsky, Manuilsky, Uritsky, Yurenev and others.

With the outbreak of World War I, Trotsky's position is still confused, and only after his arrest in England in 1917 as an opponent of the war did Lenin begin to speak of Trotsky in sympathetic tones, and after returning to Russia, the "poor hero of the phrase" is increasingly drawn into the Leninist circle. In August 1917, with a group of "mezhrayontsy" at the VI Congress of the RSDLP (b), Trotsky joined the Bolshevik Party and was elected a member of its Central Committee.

Lenin's party then already had 240 thousand members (in March 1917 - 24 thousand). And all these were not talkers, but people of action, entirely organizers and leaders of the masses. In a period of crisis, it is a powerful force, which, in fact, has already been proved by the coming events.

Around Trotsky, no more than 4,000 "mezhrayontsy" united, and besides, there were enough "heroes of a phrase" there. And now the leader of this small group is on an equal footing with the recognized leaders of a powerful party by the summer of 1917.

The plot is interesting...

Soon Trotsky - almost all his political life an active enemy of Bolshevism - becomes one of the leading figures in the Bolshevik Party and, after October 1917, is included in the Council of People's Commissars as People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs. Since 1918 he has been People's Commissar for Military and Naval Affairs, chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic, since 1919 - member of the Politburo of the Central Committee.

The transformation of Lev Davidovich from a malicious opponent of Lenin into one of the leaders of the Leninist party happened almost instantly. People usually say about such collisions: "Saul suddenly became Paul." This refers to the Apostle Paul, who was not among the 12 apostles of Christ and did not know him during his lifetime. Born into a wealthy Jewish family, Saul (Saul) was a cruel persecutor of Christians, and suddenly he had a vision - a light and a voice from heaven. Saul was baptized under the name of Paul and soon became one of the pillars of Christianity.

Something similar happened to Trotsky. But the story of Saul-Paul is a biblical parable. And here is the story of Trotsky's "conversion" of "Judas" into the leader of the Bolsheviks - historical fact.

Who benefits from this fact?

Today we are assured that Trotsky de "created the Red Army", but this is more myth than truth. For example, the merits of the former tsarist lieutenant general Mikhail Dmitrievich Bonch-Bruевич, the brother of Lenin's ally, were also rather big at first. And not just him.

But here is the undoubted list of Trotsky's "merits" to Soviet Russia...

At the end of 1917, he, being the head of the Soviet delegation at peace negotiations with Germany, disrupts them, puts forward the thesis: "No war, no peace" and threatens the existence of the RSFSR. As a result, Lenin has to go to the "obscene" Brest peace.

In the spring of 1918, strange things are happening with more than 30,000-strong Czechoslovak corps, formed in Tsarist Russia from Czech prisoners of war on the initiative of General Alekseev, the figure, it should be noted, is also dark. The tsarist generals did not send the Czechs to the front, but armed them well. It can be assumed that the bourgeois conspirators, hoping to overthrow Nicholas, saw in the Czechs such an extra-national force that could be useful to them in the future Troubles. However, events did not unfold in favor of the bourgeois "revolutionaries".

After October, the problem of the Czechs became acute. And so Trotsky first allows them to evacuate with *weapons* along a strange route to the Pacific Ocean, and then gives the order ... to disarm the Czechs, whose echelons stretched from the Volga to Baikal. As a result, Soviet Russia receives a revolt of the White Czechs and the beginning of the Civil War.

At the same time, it was Trotsky who made contacts with the professional British intelligence officer George Hill (Trotsky even makes him his aviation adviser), and through Hill with Sydney Reilly. And this "sweet" for the West, but "bitter" for Russia British couple, together with Bruce Lockhart, is preparing a "conspiracy of ambassadors."

Trotsky also looks strange in the story of the Left SR revolt of July 6–7, 1918. If this rebellion had succeeded, Lenin would have been killed for sure. But Trotsky - hardly ...

During the years of the Civil War, Trotsky rather hindered the success of military operations on various fronts - both by his attacks on the troops on the "Trotsky train", and by the support of a number of old traitor officers. For example, Trotsky's position could have led to the surrender of the "red Verdun" - Tsaritsyn, if Stalin had not saved the situation. Last but not least, Trotsky's line was the cause of our failure in the Soviet-Polish war of 1920.

After the end of the Civil War, it was Trotsky who insisted on continuing the policy of "war communism", which objectively split the bond between workers and peasants. Trotsky provocatively preaches the militarization of the trade unions, the creation of permanent "labor armies", and immediate collectivization without exception. The full implementation of any of these measures in the early 1920s could have caused the collapse of Soviet power.

With the onset of Lenin's illness, Trotsky takes a course towards a split in the CPSU (b) so clearly that Lenin writes his "Letter to the Congress", where he expresses alarm about the friction between Trotsky and Stalin. And in the same letter we find the following cryptic lines:

"Let me remind you that the October episode of Zinoviev and Kamenev, of course, was not an accident, but that it can just as little be blamed on them personally, as Trotsky's non-Bolshevism."

What does it mean? The October episode of Zinoviev and Kamenev is their publication in the fall of 1917 in the non-party press of a statement about their disagreement with the course of the Central Committee towards an armed uprising. In fact, this was a warning to the Provisional Government, a betrayal. Lenin then demanded the exclusion of both from the party, but nothing happened. However, in 1922 Lenin expressed himself incomprehensibly. How is it that some actions of quite adult people in full mind and clear memory cannot be blamed on them personally?

And also Lenin's thought in relation to Trotsky is not very clear, unless ...

Unless we proceed from the fact that Lenin already guessed that Leon Trotsky had become in the RCP (b) a "Trojan horse" of some specific "above-party" structure, which allows its members to be in any party, but ultimately requires following the guidelines of the leadership only this structure.

This is how freemasonry functions - not operetta, put on display, but real, uniting the "elite", the most irreconcilable to the interests of the working masses. And if Trotsky was the "mole" of Capital, if he was the first major "foreman of treachery" in the USSR, then many things fall into place. Although Trotsky was eventually expelled from the USSR, and

Trotskyism as an ideological trend and political force was already defeated in the USSR under the leadership of Stalin, the roots, apparently, remained.

And over time, already after the death of Stalin, under the former (let's not forget!) Trotskyist Khrushchev, the "put to sleep" Trotskyists and their children and grandchildren became the new "moles" of world Capital in the post-war USSR.

They worked for decades to destroy it. And there is no doubt that without a special declaration of their belonging to Trotskyism, the aged "moles" are still active in "Rossiania", having received the baton from their fathers and grandfathers and passing it on to their sons and grandchildren.

And we need to take this into account. After all, oddly enough, even today there are those who doubt that the course of the world social process from the end of the 19th century to the present day is seriously influenced by the "shadow" structures of the world capitalist society.
"elites".

And they do influence.

And they have been influencing for a very long time.

And now - about the second most likely "mole" of Capital in the leadership of the USSR.

When we say "Gorbachev", we must mean "Andropov". It was Andropov who was the main figure in the Brezhnev leadership, who contributed to Gorbachev's promotion "up" - I will talk about this a little later. But when we say Andropov, we must also mean another name: Kuusinen.

Otto Kuusinen "launched" Andropov into potentially high orbits, and Andropov then "launched" Gorbachev. The difference is that Andropov was seen by Kuusinen himself, while Gorbachev was apparently *recommended to Andropov...*

Today, Kuusinen's name is little known, but it would be necessary to know ... Without knowing who Kuusinen was, we will not understand who Andropov was. And if we don't understand who Andropov was, we won't understand what and why happened in Russia in the last quarter of the 20th century.

The example of Otto Vilhelmovich Kuusinen in the history of the USSR is absolutely unique - he is *the only* long-term member of the top Soviet leadership who until 1917 was professionally engaged in political activities and formed as a major politician not in the Bolshevik party, but in the Social Democratic, and not even in the Menshevik wing of the RSDLP .

The son of a tailor from the village of Laukaa in the Grand Duchy of Finland, Finn Kuusinen, being a subject of the Russian Empire and born in 1881 (died in 1964 in Moscow), could become a member of the RSDLP (b). However, from a young age he connected his life with the Finnish Social Democratic Party. Even after the revolution of 1905, during which he commanded a detachment of the Red Guard, Kuusinen remained in the Social Democratic Party and successfully labored in it until the age of 36 - until 1918!

By this age, all life attitudes and passions were basically formed, and Kuusinen's political style was not military, not Bolshevik, but parliamentary. But then - a promising Finnish social democrat in 1918 suddenly "sees the light" - in the manner of either Trotsky, or Saul-Paul - and becomes a Russian Bolshevik ...

But more on that later.

Kuusinen came from the poorest environment and, despite his brilliant abilities, was in poverty while studying at the university, interrupted his studies for a year, having gone to the store as a clerk. But - strange affair! In 1903, he received some kind of scholarship of not very clear origin and not only corrected his everyday affairs, but also traveled around Finland, agitating against the oppression of the Finns by the Russian authorities. A twist of fate? Perhaps ... But who, I wonder, "translated the arrow"?

In 1905, the future major figure in the CPSU graduated from the Faculty of History and Philology of the University of Helsingfors with the title of candidate of philosophical sciences and quickly became the leader of the left wing of the old Social Democratic Party of Finland.

From 1906 to 1908 Kuusinen was the editor of the Socialist Journal. From 1907 to

1916 - political editor of the central organ of the Social Democratic Party of Finland, the newspaper "Tyuomies" ("Worker"). From 1908 he was a member of the Central Committee of the Social Democratic Party of Finland. In 1908–1917, he was a member of the Finnish Seimas, leader of the parliamentary faction, an active figure in the Second International. That is, a consistent social democrat, a compromiser of the parliamentary type, far from Bolshevism.

Let me remind you that the Second International - an international association of socialist parties - was created in 1889 with the participation of Engels, but by the beginning of the 20th century, all the leaders of the Second International were not just compromisers. In fact, the entire top of the Second International was entirely agents of the influence of Capital in the labor movement. And Kuusinen, of course, was in this top *of his own*. Moreover, the Social Democratic leaders were, moreover, almost entirely Freemasons. And by no means an operetta.

Kuusinen was his own among the Finnish intellectuals. And this almost automatically meant closeness to the Swedish intellectuals. And the Swedish intellectuals were almost without exception Freemasons - starting with the royal dynasty, the beginning of which was laid by the apostate from Napoleon, the Napoleonic marshal Bernadotte. Bernadotte had a "Death to Kings!" tattoo on his chest, but in the end, the marshal gave birth to a new royal dynasty that reigns to this day.

So Otto Kuusinen is a figure more than curious, not cleared up in the history of Russia, dark. During the period of October 1917, he was by no means active and rather hindered the socialist revolution in Finland than developed it. Nevertheless, since January 1918, Kuusinen - a member of the revolutionary government of Finland (the Council of People's Deputies, headed by Kullervo Manner) - was commissioner for public education.

By the beginning of May 1918, German landings and the White Guards of Mannerheim suppressed the Red Finns. Kuusinen, on April 4, left for Petrograd and in August 1918 became one of the founders of the Communist Party of Finland, and in the spring of 1919, the Third Communist International. Lenin appreciates him - still, a major social democrat who has gone over to the positions of communism!

As one of the organizers of the Comintern, Kuusinen participated in all its congresses, except for II. And just at this congress - by a strange (?) coincidence, or maybe not - the question of the incompatibility of the communist movement with Freemasonry was considered. Incidentally, the initiative to raise the question came not least from Lenin.

From 1921 - from the III Congress of the Comintern - to 1939 Otto Kuusinen was a member of the Presidium and secretary of the Executive Committee of the Comintern. He often made presentations on issues of the international communist movement. He was not a leader by nature, he preferred to be behind the scenes, but just such a position for the "mole" is very convenient - behind the scenes you can learn more, but you will not attract attention to yourself.

Stalin treated the Comintern with well-founded lukewarmness (a very different audience worked there), and Kuusinen did not play important roles in Stalin's era. Only during the Soviet-Finnish war of 1939-1940. Stalin tried to use Kuusinen as a major political trump card, but the Sovietized Finland failed. And from 1940 to 1956 Kuusinen was chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Karelian-Finnish SSR and deputy chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. Since 1941 - and a member of the Central Committee of the CPSU (b).

It was then that Kuusinen "warmed up" Andropov, nominated him to the first secretaries of the Central Committee of the Komsomol of the Karelian-Finnish SSR and constantly patronized him afterwards. It seems that Kuusinen saw in the young unsociable man both the kinship of natures, and good material for the corresponding "educational" work.

After the XIX Congress of the CPSU (b) - CPSU in October 1952, Kuusinen was elected to the Presidium of the Central Committee, but after the death of Stalin he did not enter the highest circle of leadership. But after the strengthening of Khrushchev in 1957, Kuusinen again became a member of the Presidium of the Central Committee and

Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU. In fact, Kuusinen was a "grey eminence" and Khrushchev's ideologue. At the same time, Kuusinen warmed many dubious "intellectuals".

In fact, he didn't have *any* dubious pets at all. All of his "pupils", who in the late 50s - early 60s were thirty or forty years old, after twenty or thirty years, in one way or another, entered the legion of "foremen of treason." Among the "young shoots" of Kuusinen was, for example, the future academician Georgy Arbatov -

subsequently a confidant of both Andropov and Brezhnev.

Arbatov wrote about Kuusinen thus:

"Kuusinen was an excellent teacher. He was a man with a fresh memory, a mind open to the new, then unusual for us flexibility of thought, readiness for a bold search. Besides, he thought..."

Well, such an assessment of Kuusinen by a figure like Georgy Arbatov is suggestive in itself. Both Arbatov himself and his son Alexei flourished during the Brezhnev years. But they especially flourished during the years of "perestroika", and Arbatov Jr. - during the years of Yeltsinism. Moreover, having previously stigmatized "US imperialism", after the collapse of the USSR, both became apologists for "partnership with the USA" and demonstrated outstanding "flexibility" of thought and conscience. I wonder if Kuusinen applauded them from the coffin? If not, then most likely because he was buried not in a coffin, but in the Kremlin wall, after cremation.

As for Andropov, he turned out to be not only the most advanced, but also, it seems, the most consistent student of Otto Wilhelmovich - Andropov's "bold" search was crowned with the fact that he found Mikhail Gorbachev. Although I guess that some people *helped Andropov in this search*.

Having nothing to do with one of the "foremen of treason" - a member of the Politburo "Alexander N." Yakovlev, the writer and historian Nikolai Nikolaevich Yakovlev, the son of Marshal of Artillery Yakovlev, left very interesting testimonies about Andropov and Gorbachev. Yakovlev testifies that Andropov himself compared the persistence of the secretary of the Stavropol regional committee Gorbachev in getting into Andropov's field of vision with the persistence of Ilfo-Petrovsky's father Fyodor. Like, Gorbachev is seeking the post of secretary of the Central Committee in the same way that Father Fyodor was trying to get a Gambian set of twelve chairs from the engineer Bruns. This was told to Yakovlev by Andropov himself, who was very fond of the novel by Ilf and Petrov.

When Yakovlev asked why not send the provincial party apparatchik away and "not sell him chairs," the supposedly all-powerful head of the KGB laughed it off, again quoting the "Twelve Chairs," which he knew by heart.

And then he mysteriously concluded: "You will see the result" ...

We saw!

But why was Andropov - against his will - forced to patronize Gorbachev?

That's it!

Interestingly, in the early seventies, N. Yakovlev, by order of Andropov, with whom Yakovlev was brought together by Dmitry Fyodorovich Ustinov, who knew "Kolya" from childhood, wrote and, with the help of Andropov, published a book about the beginning of the First World War, which clearly indicated the Masonic roots of this war, including in Russia.

Today, reading Yakovlev would be an amusing activity if it were not for our sad reality. Thus, Yakovlev, on the one hand, cites data that is devastating for Andropov, that a number of high-ranking accomplices in the destruction of the USSR were selected and favored precisely and exclusively by Andropov. What is one phrase about Arbatov Sr. worth:

"Where was I (N.N. Yakovlev. - S.K.) to know then that Arbatov was close to Brezhnev, who lovingly called him "Abrasha", and Andropov was nurtured in the wilds of the Central Committee of the CPSU."

On the other hand, Yakovlev sincerely considers Andropov a man devoted to socialist system, calls him a dreamer politician and writes:

"Andropov repeatedly repeated to me... that it's not about democracy, he is the first to stand for it, but that the urge for democracy inevitably led to the collapse of the traditional Russian state... Dissidents helped our ill-wishers, opening the door for the West to interfere in the internal problems of our country... »

The idea is correct, but I am convinced that such maxims were for Andropov just a kind of "smoke screen". He said one thing, did another ... Masons are great masters of this.

Yes, the topic of possible "moles" in the top Soviet leadership, starting from the very moment of the formation of the Soviet state, is an interesting and still not developed topic.

However, although this topic has not been seriously developed by anyone yet, I personally do not see much point in its deep development today. Later, if we restore the Soviet Union, future historians can do similar research, but now is it really so important - who specifically labored in this vile, double-dealing role?

For our urgent goals and objectives, the very fact of their presence is important. It is important that the "moles" of Capital surrounded by the Soviet leadership and even in the highest echelons of power in the USSR could not be missing, and they were already at the dawn of Soviet power. And not in isolated quantities.

And personally, I have very little doubt that at different times Trotsky and Kuusinen were among them, and later the Trotskyites and Kuusinen's "learned students", including Andropov, who were not killed or rehabilitated by the Khrushchevites. And from them the threads stretched further - into our today and - if we are still stupid - into our tomorrow.

Sometimes it's not so difficult to understand what and why. For example, a former member of Gorbachev's Politburo "Alexander N." Yakovlev, after the collapse of the USSR, proved himself to be such an outspoken anti-communist that there is little doubt that he was directly recruited in the United States as a young man, during his internship at Harvard University. But not all "moles" are illuminated even today. After all, if the "moles" of the West were already in the Soviet leadership in Lenin and Stalin's times, then they could not but prepare a replacement for themselves within the USSR - without any direct recruitment, but - subtly "educating" future internal emigrants. It seems that this is how it was with the same Kuusinen and Andropov.

Kuusinen was considered the greatest socialist theorist. Well, what kind of revelations did he give us? The highest achievement of scientific communism was Stalin's "Economic Problems of Socialism", and the Kuusinens and Suslovs did everything to ensure that the ideas of this pinnacle of creative Marxism were pushed away from the people. Only conscious enemies of socialism could act in this way.

And just as strange are the deeds of the same Trotsky after October - against the background of his own speeches, which reveal an undoubted and very sharp mind. Moreover, if Trotsky had not been expelled from the country, but received full power in the USSR, this would have ended in the death of the USSR by the beginning of the 40s. Here, too, I have no particular doubts.

But Andropov *received full power in the USSR*. So what? And how did he manage it? All he was willing to do was to initiate raids on Soviet citizens who fled from work to cinemas and shops. Oh well...

But he could, having come to Staraya Square from *Lubyanka*, turn around in the socialist reform of post-Brezhnev Soviet society in such a way that not only high-ranking corrupt officials and "Soviet nobles", not only the world capitalist "elite", but also the devil in hell would become sickening!

And after all, Yuri Andropov was not so stupid not to understand *what* needs to be done - *immediately* after coming to power - in order to clear the blockages that formed on the path of socialism in the Khrushchev and Brezhnev times in the interests of strengthening and developing the USSR.

But, firstly, he himself created these blockages, among others. And secondly, Andropov, apparently, had other tasks. He had to finally prepare the conditions for the murder of the USSR, weakened by the "mole" work of his predecessors.

And to conclude this chapter, which has taken us through a chain of events in the very early years, I will give a contemporary testimony. In 2007, Rossiyskaya Gazeta (No. 191 dated August 31, 2007, pp. 8–9) published an interview with KGB Major General Yuri Ivanovich Drozdov, who from 1979 to August 1991 headed Directorate "C" of the KGB of the USSR (illegal intelligence service). Here is what he said at the time:

"A few years ago, a former American intelligence officer whom I knew well, upon arriving in Moscow, over dinner at a restaurant on Ostozhenka, threw the following phrase: "You are good guys. We know that you have had successes that you can be proud of. But time will pass, and you will gasp if it is declassified what kind of agents the CIA and the State Department had at the top."

I still hear the voice, I remember those words. And they make me think that perhaps it is in this phrase of the American that the key lies why *the leaders* of the (emphasis mine. - S. K.) of the USSR, having a maximum of reliable information about the true intentions of Washington, could not resist the destruction of the country ... "

People like General Drozdov are not accustomed to throwing words, and he used the word "leaders", of course, not in vain. And since the United States had its direct agents among *the leaders* of the USSR, it is clear that these "leaders" not only "could not" and even did not want to resist the destruction of the country, but, on the contrary, deliberately and purposefully destroyed it.

And one more interesting "information for reflection" on the topic from the interview of General Drozdov.

In the Brezhnev era, when Drozdov was a legal resident of intelligence in New York, the Soviet Deputy UN Secretary General Shevchenko defected to the enemy (close, by the way, to the head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Gromyko, a figure also obscure). It was a serious blow to the state and its interests.

Drozdov warned about a possible betrayal of Shevchenko, but Moscow let everything go "on the brakes".

When Shevchenko really changed, the then representative of the USSR to the UN Oleg Troyanovsky (1919-2003), the son of the former plenipotentiary of the USSR in the USA Alexander Troyanovsky (1882-1955), a member of the Central Audit Commission from 1981 to 1986 and a candidate member of the Central Committee of the CPSU since 1986 to 1990, said to Drozdov *literally* the following: "After all, can a Soviet person choose a new homeland for himself?"

Ugh, maybe...

If he is a bastard and a traitor.

Chapter 7

August 22, 1991 (evening): fireworks over Moscow

Yes, betrayal...

It was this word that sat in me all day on August 22, 1991, while I paced and paced around Moscow. And another word seethed and boiled in my chest: "Foolish!"

In the evening I reached the hotel. There were still few guests in it, but it was for the best - I didn't want to talk about anything. I wanted to scream, say with

some tribune to speak, to try to reason... Alas, that evening in Moscow there would not have been a single tribune from which one could have delivered a speech in defense of the USSR. Such a speaker, of course, would not have been beaten to death, but they simply would not have listened to him.

The TV was on in the hall, and a small group of people sat in front of it. Watched the chronicle, talked sluggishly. The screen showed how the driver of an infantry fighting vehicle was trying to move a trolleybus torn to pieces by the night crowd off the road. Now it became clear to me the origin of that strange acute-angled dent in the hull of the trolleybus, which I saw in the morning, not far from Smolenskaya Square with a high-rise building of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR.

I confess that the sight of a broken, crumpled trolleybus did not shock me so much as puzzled me. I did not see the chronicle that I was watching now, I stood there, perplexed, and could not understand - what happened to the trolleybus, who and how could do it, and most importantly - how in the middle of the day in the center of Moscow such burnt scrap metal can calmly stick out, and there are no police, firemen, or tow trucks nearby?

From Smolenka to Kalinin Avenue, people were walking straight along the roadway, flowers and some pots were scattered on the pavement, overwrought youths were dancing on the roof of the trolleybus, waving something, they were clearly drunk. Have fun downstairs too company of youths.

Well, what was to take from *these* ? These - under the chorus: "GULAG, GULAG, there was only GULAG, the USSR is GULAG ..." - for the last five years they have been taught to see in the USSR and in its history only bad.

However, even these had fathers and mothers, grandfathers and grandmothers, who hardly heard about that GULAG. School curricula then were also not anti-communist - as they are now. But here *they* were brought up not by the family, not by the school, but by Gorbachev and Yeltsin's "intellectuals". And perhaps it was just the children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren of the old "moles".

It was unusual to look at their unbridledness, at this joyful dance of death. I stood, watching, and moved on.

A tall, lean man in his fifties suddenly turned out over his shoulder, overtaking me. An inexpensive suit, a good Russian face, almost like a poster, but already with the stamp of honestly lived years. The man, not addressing anyone and as if trying to persuade himself, repeated over and over again: "Maybe it's the way it should be? Maybe this party should be banned?!"

I thought - what was the psychological pressure on Muscovites all these days, if a seemingly normal Soviet person, fully formed by the Soviet era, could speak *like that* and - with such hatred. There was something abnormal, pathological, zombified in this.

Yes, the CPSU, "the leading and guiding force of Soviet society" ...

For a long time I had no illusions about what the CPSU is - especially in its nomenclature, leadership part. I fully understood the essence of the old anecdote of "Armenian radio", which, in response to the question: "Will the CPSU be dissolved after the victory of communism?" - said: "Nah! It is not worth polluting the ranks of non-party people." But, understanding all this, I did not doubt for a minute that although the Brezhnev CPSU is a perverted caricature of the true Communist Party, the official guidelines of even the Brezhnev CPSU are ideas of goodness and creation. The question was that the words again - as many years ago - did not disagree with the case.

Just!

By the summer of 1991, it was clear that the elimination of the CPSU would mean the elimination of Soviet power, and the elimination of Soviet power would mean the elimination of normal life, the elimination of the power of Russia and, as a result, the elimination of Russia in general.

Alas, by the same summer of 1991, it became clear that not so many Soviet people understand this *in all its acuteness*. Burning anti-Sovietism and anti-communism, Gorbachev and Yeltsinists in the Soviet masses could not bring up by 1991, but it would have been then

empty occupation. However, with the help of a pack of "perestroika foremen" from the intelligentsia, the Soviet masses were deceived.

If Yeltsin had gone to the elections of the President of the RSFSR with an anti-Soviet, anti-socialist, capitalist program for the collapse of the USSR, then he would not have received the support of even 5 percent of the population. Well, taking into account the intellectual hysteria in the media, this renegade could get 10 percent of the vote, but not the more than 40 to 50 percent that he had in different regions of the RSFSR.

Perhaps it should be recalled that the main candidates for the post of President of the RSFSR were, in addition to Yeltsin, Nikolai Ryzhkov - Gorbachev Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, commander of the Volga Military District, Colonel General Makashov, Aman Tuleev from Kuzbass - another renegade, but, unlike Yeltsin, not the rabid type. An indispensable member of the "company" Zhirinovskiy also appeared on the list (he then scored "his" 8% for the first time).

If General Makashov had been elected President of the RSFSR (he had an intelligent professor-economist Sergeev in his "bundle" as a candidate for vice-president), then we would still live in the USSR and at the same time prosper in conditions of a developed socialist democracy, without thinking a single thing. about what exchange rates, oligarchs, the WTO, intestinal infections from Europe, forest fires, etc.

And to Egypt - if anyone would like - sit down and go.

Even if the "weeping Bolshevik" Ryzhkov had been elected President, the plans for the collapse of the USSR would, perhaps, have been put an end to.

However, the people chose Yeltsin because he was created - through the efforts of Yeltsinoid intellectuals and direct agents of Western influence - the image of a decisive, energetic reformer of socialism. This is how Yeltsin was perceived by the majority of voters in the RSFSR, and that is why he was elected.

I stood in the lobby of the "atomic" hotel and looked at the TV screen. There was a close-up of Yeltsin's one... However, I'll be fair, at that time *a face that had not yet blurred was looking at Russia from the screen*. Yeltsin had not yet lost his relatively human face, but it was still so disgusting to look at him that I could not resist and threw out: "Bastard!"

No one jumped up, only one of those sitting in front of the TV lazily remarked: "After all, you, friend, take it easy" ... Well, the mood of this small group of non-resident Soviet citizens who were accidentally caught in Moscow by the surging events, *not Muscovites*, was indicative - except for Moscow and a number of large cities in the country that were especially heavily *polluted* by "intellectuals" were sympathetically more likely towards the State Emergency Committee than towards its overthrowers.

However, the people throughout the country did not support the GKChP - after all, this required an organization, and the state body of the USSR was disorganized. In Moscow, then, as it is becoming clearer now, all the methods of psychological warfare were used *to the fullest* - from propaganda to scientific and technical ones.

The video block of the chronicle ended, the repetition began, and I went to the room - I wanted to relax before the next hard day. But suddenly gun salvos rang out outside the window - densely, amicably.

Once, then - again, again ...

At the first moment, my heart trembled and a crazy, crazy thought flashed through me, colored with joy and disbelief: "Have you really come to your senses? Did the Soviet troops finally enter Moscow, which overnight turned into anti-Soviet, sweeping away all this evil spirits and *nonsense* ?

I jumped up, ready to jump out into the street, but then I saw colored reflections in the glass of the open window and realized that this was not the Soviet Liberation Army, but simply Yeltsin's "fiery fun", the triumphant "salute" of the "democrats".

This is how that evening remained in my memory: instant crazy joy, and immediately

behind it - cruel disappointment and clenched teeth - under the bacchanalia of Yeltsin's "salute".

Chapter 8

Historical digression No. 1: Khrushchev's "corn" USSR

And now I would like to temporarily draw the reader back into our Soviet past in order to point out a number of such circumstances of this past, which today are seen as outstanding in the destruction of the USSR.

In particular, we will have to dwell at least briefly, but separately, on the June 1957 Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU, at which the "anti-party group" of Molotov - Malenkov - Kaganovich was crushed. Today, the essence of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, destructive for the fate of the USSR, has already been well revealed, but the June Plenum has not yet been assessed for its destructive significance. It's time to do it.

This plenum opened (whether by coincidence or otherwise) on June 22, 1957, and today we can say that *June 22* turned out to be even more black for the fate of Russia than June 22, 1941. We later managed to correct the black consequences of 1941, but the consequences of the second black June day still weigh on Russia.

But first - a small, so to speak, introduction ...

By the beginning of the 1920s, the Civil War had died down in Russia, and external intervention was successfully repelled. Socialist construction began - for the time being with modest tasks.

On April 3, 1922, after the XI Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), the Plenum of the Central Committee elected Stalin as General Secretary of the Central Committee. And on December 30, 1922, at the 1st All-Union Congress of Soviets, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was formed. A new and seemingly most promising stage began in the history of the Russian state.

In my previous books, I have written more than once about that great and unique in its "public nerve" era, when socialist Russia arose from bastard Russia in a matter of ten years, and I will not repeat myself now. I will cite only one new testimony from a camp hostile to the Soviet Union, and from what a hostile camp!

In the 1950s, Albert Speer, former Minister of Armaments of the Third Reich, a man very close to Hitler, who received 20 years in prison at the Nuremberg Trials, wrote in his memoirs:

"... I also happened to visit (in 1943. - **S.K.**) in such an industrial center as Dnepropetrovsk. I was deeply struck by the abundance of institutes and technical schools in it (*then, of course, they did not work.* - **S.K.**). No German city could compare with it. The inexorable desire of the Soviet Union to become one of the leading industrial powers made a very strong impression on us.

This unwitting recognition of an intelligent enemy in itself turns out to be both a complete historical justification for the Stalin era and an undoubted historical verdict on the current Kremlin! As, however, the verdict and the current Kyiv, Alma-Ata, Tbilisi, Chisinau, Baku, etc.

Moreover, Dnepropetrovsk was not the largest center of education in Ukraine! In Kharkov, which until 1934 was the capital of Ukraine, and in Kyiv, there were even more universities and technical schools. And almost all of them were created and developed by the Soviet state.

Through the efforts of Chief Speer, Speer himself and others like him, in 1941 and 1942, much of what was created in Soviet Russia in three incomplete five-year plans, we had to destroy - with our own hands. When Speer visited the Dneproges, the waters of the Dnieper erupted

through several huge breaches in the beautiful dam. And the turbogenerators were a wild mishmash of twisted metal. In order to reliably put them out of action, Soviet engineers in 1941 stopped the supply of lubricant to the mechanisms, and soon they were irreversibly destroyed.

By the end of 1942, not only the Kharkov, but also the Stalingrad Tractor Plant lay in ruins. And these factories were the pride of the new Russia and the backbone of its new agriculture.

Yes, it was. However, the Country of Soviets, created in a matter of years, rose from the ruins also in a matter of years and at the same time was able to reliably ensure its military security. By 1953, the Soviet Union had eliminated the US monopoly on nuclear weapons and was strengthening its foreign policy position.

On the other hand, serious contradictions arose within the USSR between the theoretically Soviet nature of the state and, in fact, the party character of the leadership of the state.

There was a threat of bureaucratization of party organs. And the tasks of the country's development demanded the transfer of management into the hands of professionals brought up by socialism.

The management of the daily life of society with its vital concerns had to move from the party to the organs of Soviet power, elected by the whole people.

The leadership of the scientific, technical and economic development of society was to pass from the party into the hands of socialist professionals in the field of economics, science and technology.

Realizing this, Stalin was going to carry out a radical reform of the state system and put the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Council of Ministers of the USSR in the first place, and leave the task of ideological education of society to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Stalin also intended to switch to alternative elections to the organs of Soviet power. And this was dangerous for the decomposed part of the party leaders - they could simply not be elected, preferring other candidates.

It was dangerous and personally for the ignorant Nikita Khrushchev. He always had a lot of energy, but now other times were coming - knowledge and intelligence were needed. Khrushchev could quickly find himself without a chair, and therefore he became the main engine of the conspiracy against Stalin. Stalin was poisoned literally on the eve of the start of large-scale and urgent reforms in Soviet society.

For the first time, Stalin intended to hold alternative elections to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR immediately after the adoption of the new Constitution of the USSR in 1936. Ballot papers already at the first elections according to the new Constitution had to contain several surnames. The then part of the degenerated "nomenklatura" was in a panic, and it was its provocations that made the scale of the repressions of 1937 greater than the situation required (although less than the "democrats" claim). But in 1937, Stalin preempted the degenerates and, in the course of the repressive campaign initiated by them, rid the country of them. Now, in 1953, the degenerates preempted Stalin.

The death of Stalin and the rise of the Khrushchevites dramatically changed the situation. In Khrushchev's entourage there were already "moles" of the West, and this created the conditions for organizing a covert and carefully disguised dismantling of socialism in the USSR. The liquidation of Stalin in March 1953 was followed by the discrediting and liquidation of the best manager of socialism, Lavrenty Beria, in June 1953.

Stalin's comrades-in-arms Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov, who remained true to the ideas of socialism, did not find the strength to support Beria and, intimidated by Khrushchev, succumbed to Khrushchev's provocations.

In 1956, at the 20th Congress, Stalin was discredited in Khrushchev's report on the "cult of personality." Today, for those who look at the past, present and future of Russia with sighted eyes, it is already becoming commonplace to assess the "Khrushchev report" (not written by him, of course) as the most powerful sabotage against the USSR and socialism. On this subject it is said

already a lot of true, and said by many. And although the topic could be developed, I will not deal with it here. I will only note that a later analysis of the situation allows us to see Kuusinen's ears among the true authors of the "Khrushchev report".

At the 20th Congress, Khrushchev bluntly lied about the role of Stalin as a commander, claimed that Stalin had almost fallen into prostration with the outbreak of the war, that he led the fronts "according to the globe", etc.

None of those present, including Molotov and the marshals of the Soviet Union led by Zhukov, refuted this lie, and Khrushchev became more and more unrestrained. In the spring of 1957, he made an absolutely unrealistic public appeal in Leningrad to catch up and *overtake* the United States of America *by 1960* in the production of meat, milk and butter per capita.

population.

The 20th Congress set the realistic task of catching up with the most developed capitalist countries in terms of output per capita *in general terms*, and Khrushchev "concretized" the deadlines, exposing not only himself, but also the Presidium of the Central Committee, and the Central Committee, and the CPSU, and in general the entire Soviet people.

The reborn party functionaries - the first secretaries of the regional committees of the CPSU, the ministers of the USSR obediently agreed with Khrushchev (among them was, alas, the future "great reformer of the economy" Alexei Kosygin).

Behind Khrushchev stood two differently influential layers. One - visible, massive - consisted of the "selfish" part of the highest party-state nomenklatura, which loved itself in the State, and not the State in itself. The second layer - invisible, numerically small at first, but gaining strength, consisted of agents of influence of the West, who were not yet occupying major posts, but close to the top leadership - referents, consultants, employees of the apparatus of the Central Committee of the CPSU, the USSR Council of Ministers, the USSR Academy of Sciences, the capital's "cultural » bohemians, etc.

Khrushchev's adventures were bound to cost the country dearly. Khrushchev, as the head of the party and state, had to be urgently changed, and at the same time, to carry out those reforms that Stalin was preparing. However, the degenerate nomenklatura and the young "fifth column" again forestalled the forces of socialism. In June 1957, at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU, the last competent members of the Stalinist leadership, Molotov, Malenkov and Kaganovich, were removed from the leadership of the country, denying Khrushchev's adventurous course of building communism in a matter of years.

And it is at this fateful Plenum of the Central Committee that we must dwell in more detail. For the future fate of socialism and the USSR, it was even more sinister and decisive than the 20th Congress of the CPSU. The June 1957 Plenum was formally directed against the so-called "anti-party group", but in fact it turned out to be even more anti-Stalinist and anti-Soviet than the 20th Congress.

Actually, if it were not for Khrushchev's report on the "cult" made "at the end" of the congress, the 20th congress could be regarded as quite businesslike. The overwhelming mass of ordinary delegates to the 20th Congress consisted of Soviet people who honestly worked for the prosperity of the USSR.

Another thing is the Plenum of the Central Committee in June 1957. It represented only the highest party-state stratum of Soviet society. And at the Plenum she quite clearly showed her selfish mug and readiness to go not for those who orient her towards the difficult task of breaking down "hostile attempts to slow down and frustrate the cause of building socialism and achieve complete success in the implementation of our great goals", as he said Stalin in 1952, but for those who provide the "nomenclature" with a satisfying and comfortable life.

Stalin in 1952 addressed from the podium of the Plenum of the Central Committee to the "politicians of Lenin's experience" devoted to socialism in the hope that they could be handed over the baton of his great cause. However, less than five years had passed, and the figures of the Leninist-Stalinist temper were partly relegated to secondary roles, and partly slandered and betrayed by the political

of death.

Here's how it was...

I note that the events that preceded the June 1957 Plenum of the Central Committee, I state in accordance with the way they were presented in 1998 by Vladimir Naumov, the author of the preface to the collection of documents "Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovich. 1957" published by the International Foundation "Democracy". I use Naumov's scheme intentionally, so that no one accuses me of describing those fatal events in a one-sided and biased way.

So, by the summer of 1957, the situation in the top leadership of the USSR was acute. The majority of the then Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU accused Khrushchev of:

- violation of the principle of collective leadership;
- rudeness and intolerance towards colleagues;
- encouragement of Khrushchev's personality cult;
- planting the practice of suppressing the initiative and independence of Soviet

organs;

- the interception by party bodies of the economic functions of the Soviets that are not characteristic of them;
- major miscalculations in agriculture;
- dangerous zigzags in foreign policy;
- discrediting members of the former Stalinist leadership by Khrushchev, the Secretariat

Central Committee, secretaries of the Central Committee of the Union republics and the first secretaries of the regional committees.

I note that all the accusations hit, as they say, not in the eyebrow, but in the eye. And already coming years have shown the legitimacy of all these accusations.

In the second half of June 1957, the Presidium of the Central Committee raised the question of the advisability of continuing to retain the post of First Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU. *I emphasize that it was only about this post, and not about the first secretaries of the republican Central Committee and regional committees of the CPSU.*

The majority of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU in seven votes (and these were the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR Bulganin, the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR Voroshilov, the first deputies of the Presidium of the USSR Presidium Molotov, Kaganovich, Pervukhin, Saburov and Deputy Predsovmir Malenkov) decided to dismiss Khrushchev from his post *in order to come up with this proposal on behalf of the Presidium at the Plenum of the Central Committee.*

That is, there was no talk of any "seizure of power". The members of the Presidium of the Central Committee, elected by the Plenum of the Central Committee after the 20th Congress, openly gathered for discussion and by an overwhelming majority adopted a certain decision in order to then convene the Plenum and propose to the Plenum that this decision be approved.

Four people spoke out against it then (even three, since Khrushchev himself was the fourth): Khrushchev, Kirichenko (a frank Khrushchev sycophant of rare mediocrity), Mikoyan and Suslov (figures by that time were also not very clear).

The whole structure of the emerging Khrushchev "voluntarism" could collapse overnight. In a legal way, that is, by the decision of the Presidium of the Central Committee, the convened Plenum of the Central Committee, Khrushchev could have been defeated if Molotov, Kaganovich, Malenkov and others had behaved wisely.

However, Stalin's true comrades-in-arms were far from hypocrisy and did not master the art of intrigue. They wanted to act within the framework of party democracy, and Khrushchev led the intrigue. He personally falsified the "decision" to convene the Plenum of the Central Committee on June 22 at 2 pm "on an internal party issue", and the then chairman of the KGB of the USSR Ivan Serov, with the support of Marshal Zhukov and the USSR Ministry of Defense, urgently delivered the members of the Central Committee to Moscow by military transport aircraft .

On June 22, 1957, the Plenum, unexpected for the "Stalinist" majority of the Presidium of the Central Committee, broke out, and the "surprise factor" at this Plenum, which, by the strange irony of history, began on the day of the sixteenth anniversary of the start of the war, worked to the fullest. At the XX Congress of the CPSU, Bolshevism, as an ideological and saving trend for Russia, was

broken. At the June 1957 Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU, he was actually defeated. From a *historical point of view, it was worse than 1941*. The Bolsheviks, Khrushchev's accusers, turned into defendants at this Plenum - accused by a pack of careerists and degenerates.

Clever move!

However, it is highly probable that it was not Khrushchev who played the main role in this. On the eve of the Plenum, he was ready to compromise with the Molotov group, but the growing "moles" and all sorts of "gray cardinals" in Khrushchev's entourage and in general in the leadership of the CPSU could not allow Khrushchev to fall (just like, by the way, much later, the "democrats" could not allow Yeltsin's personal fall). Too much was then at stake for too many, starting with the reborn supreme partocratic bastards. The fall of Khrushchev would have been disadvantageous for the world capitalist "elite" as well. It already had a strong agency of influence among the Khrushchevites, and the "moles" already had a strong support in the form of the majority of the "secretary-ministerial" layer of the Central Committee, which by that time loved itself in the State, and not the State in itself.

Even the "democrat" Naumov in the preface to the collection of documents about the June Plenum 1957 was forced to honestly admit:

"During the June plenum, a lot of words were said about reforms in industry and measures to boost agriculture. However, in all approaches to reforms, to measures to boost agriculture, which the country, millions of its citizens were so looking forward to, personal ambitions came to the fore ...

... Party leaders of the republics, regions ... received a certain freedom of action. They understood the fight against Stalinism as strengthening their position, as a guarantee of personal security...

... Therefore, the victory at the June plenum was not so much a victory for Khrushchev as a victory for the secretaries of the regional committees - members of the Central Committee of the party. They intervened at the moment when Khrushchev was already ready to compromise with his opponents..."

Well, there is nothing to argue with. Reading the transcript of the June Plenum clearly shows and proves that even then the main part of the Khrushchev Central Committee did not have a serious ideological basis and in the future could only evolve towards careerism, indifference to the interests of the country and the people with an increasing desire for personal well-being.

Collection of documents "Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovich. 1957" of 1998, containing the verbatim record of the Plenum and other documents, is a hefty volume. Read it - if you understand what is at stake, you can drink it without stopping, just like reading an exciting adventurous novel. At the same time, it is psychologically difficult to read it - it is very clearly seen how the systemic murder of the Soviet State began at this Plenum.

Yes, this Plenum and its analysis deserve a separate book, but I will have to confine myself to some quotations and comments on them. (All italics in quotations are mine. - S.K.)

On the very first day, Khrushchev began by frankly flattering the regional secretaries and ministers: "Comrades, we, members of the Presidium of the Central Committee, we are the servants of *the Plenum*, and the Plenum *is the master*."

That was *the beginning*...

However, Marshal Zhukov, who spoke immediately after Khrushchev, also felt himself the master. Zhukov's lengthy and self-confident speech could be reduced to one extremely provocative and completely false statement. Zhukov said:

"We are offered to liquidate the position of first secretaries in the center *and in the regions*. The question is, who will lead the Central Committee, *the regional committees*? They say secretariats, but after all

this will inevitably give rise to irresponsibility and disorganization ... "

Further down the transcript:

H o l o s. Right.

Zhukov. This will inevitably belittle the role and influence of the party in the entire life of the country.

H o l o s a. Right.

Molotov. Need to know...

H o l o s a. Explain later.

Zhukov. Such a proposal must be dismissed as unacceptable...", etc.

Zhukov lied, provoking the secretaries, and certain "voices" immediately gagged Molotov. And these "voices" accompanied all sessions throughout the entire Plenum. It is unlikely that members of the Central Committee would agree to such a role - the audience is still solid. And therefore, it can be assumed that some clackers were brought to the meeting room of the Plenum of the Central Committee for the highest - between congresses - party meeting of the CPSU, acting according to pre-given instructions.

So, Zhukov lied, and his lies became obvious during the Plenum after the speeches of the main defendants.

This is how Malenkov said: "I do not consider it expedient to eliminate (*the posts of first secretaries*. - S. K) *on the ground* .

And here is how Molotov: "I, comrades, see nothing wrong with the fact that we discussed the issue of eliminating the post of First Secretary. I must add that *we were not talking about the secretaries of the Central Committees of the Union Republics, nor about the secretaries of the regional committees and regional committees*, but, comrades, at the top, the role of the First Secretary is the role that is of particular importance, and here the violation of the collective leadership is more dangerous. .

And here is Shepilov, who "joined them": "A question about the First Secretary (Noise in the Hall)." I'll answer now... No one mentioned the liquidation of the post of first secretaries *in the field* . There was no such proposal .

But the audience was already in a quite definite mood and did not want to listen to anything explaining the position of the members of the "anti-Party group". At the end of the 1920s, the regenerating part of the Soviet "nomenklatura" believed: "For all the years, for all the hardships, there will be no deaf doubts, under this peaceful sky I want to laugh and love" ... Mayakovsky scoffed at such a "line", rightly remarking "For fun, our planet is poorly equipped, "and Stalin severely interrupted this" line "in the late 30s.

Now selfishness has again crept into the Kremlin. In 1947, Stalin said: "There are few restless people in our leadership ... There are such people: if they are well, then they think that everyone is well ..." Ten years after these words were spoken in the Stalinist Kremlin, in the Khrushchev Kremlin there were those who thought exactly that. They were tired of Stalinist anxiety, they wanted Khrushchev's "nomenclature" prosperity, behind which the final Brezhnev degradation of the USSR leadership already loomed.

Of the many possible examples that abound in the materials of the June 1957 Plenum, I will cite one, but what a one!

Marshal Zhukov at the Plenum behaved in a businesslike way, like some kind of party patriarch and judge. Speaking at the first meeting on June 22, he said, in part:

"You know Yakir... He was arrested for nothing. On June 29, 1937, on the eve of his death, he wrote a letter to Stalin in which he addressed: "Dear, close comrade Stalin! I dare to address you like this, because I have said everything, and it seems to me that I am an honest and devoted fighter to the party, state, people, which I have been for many years. All my conscious life was spent in selfless, honest work in the sight of the Party and its leaders. I die with words of love for you, the party, the country, with a fervent faith in victory

communism "...", etc.

History sometimes jokes dashing jokes! Georgy Konstantinovich did not know that in half a century, in 2008, the Russian Political Encyclopedia publishing house would publish, albeit with a circulation of one thousand copies, documents and materials of the Military Council under the People's Commissar of Defense of the USSR, which was held from June 1 to June 4, 1937 - immediately after the arrest of Tukhachevsky, Uborevich and others, including the commander of the 1st rank Iona Yakir.

So, firstly, on June 29, 1937, Yakir could not write to anyone, because on June 12, 1937 he was shot. I don't know if he personally wrote to Stalin on the eve of the execution, but it's unlikely - most likely such a letter would have been given in the 2008 collection of documents. However, only Yakir's letter to People's Commissar of Internal Affairs Yezhov dated June 10, 1937 was published there as an appendix, which begins like this:

"To the People's Commissar of Internal Affairs N. I. Yezhov.

If you consider it possible and necessary, I ask you to pass it on to the Central Committee and NPOs (*that is, just Stalin and Voroshilov*). - **S.K.**).

I said everything. It seems to me that I am again that honest, devoted to the party fighter, which I was about 17 years old (*that is, from 1918 to 1935*). - **S.K.**), and therefore I dare to put a number of questions before you, a number of last thoughts and suggestions ... "

As you can see, Yakir began his letter differently than Zhukov read. But further - more! After all, Yakir wrote not just a letter, but a whole memorandum on the need for improvements in the Red Army, the power of which he himself undermined from the mid-30s. This lengthy note - no NKVD investigator could have dictated it - is replete with phrases like: "This section is especially affected by ... wrecking ...", "... it is possible to raise, correct the results of sabotage in a short time ...", "the results of sabotage are great ...", "... along with pests, myopia and poor work reigned, "etc. And towards the end, it starts to break through and this is what (emphasis mine):

"... Not everything is written, which would definitely be necessary. It turns out everything is wrong with me, vaguely, unorganized in this last note. It's hard work, but I'll try to keep going. You write, and the thought comes back all the time: *how did you get into the camp of enemies, how did you go against your country, how did you end up on the other side of the barricades ...* "

So, Yakir was guilty and conscious of it, belatedly repenting of what he had done. But these authentic dying confessions of Yakir were not read out at the June plenum, of course. And do I need to explain why?

However, then it was not only Zhukov who lied, all the "accusers" lied. Here is what a certain Dudorov said in 1941-1946. Head of Glavthermoizolyatsiya NK Building Materials, then - head of Glavgips, in 1950 - secretary of the party committee of the Ministry of Industry and Construction Materials, etc., and at the time of the Plenum - the Minister of Internal Affairs of the USSR.

"It is known that only after the arrest of Beria, work on hydrogen weapons was actively developed and a test of a hydrogen bomb was provided already in August 1953.

of the year".

Work on hydrogen weapons under the leadership of Beria, to which the head of Glavgips Dudorov was not allowed to come close, had been actively carried out since the end of the 40s, and the test of the RDS-6s hydrogen bomb on August 12, 1953 was the result of Beria's enormous efforts. But what is especially sad is that four years ago, the same people in the same hall accused Beria of exactly the opposite. For example, Malyshev, in 1953 the Minister of Medium Machine Building, at the "Anti-Beria" Plenum of the Central Committee in July 1953, stated:

"Comrade Malenkov said that he (*L.P. Beria* - S.K.) signed a very important decision on experiments with a hydrogen bomb. We started digging through the archives and found that he signed a number of the largest decisions ... "

Yes, in 1953 Malenkov lost heart and became one of the wrong judges of Beria. Now the past unprincipled policy of Malenkov, as well as Molotov and Kaganovich, was boomeranging at them.

Malenkov was the first of the three to speak, and his performance turned out to be sluggish, although not in everything. When it came to the repressions of 1937 and other things like that, Khrushchev made a remark that, they say, I'm not me, and the horse is not mine, and I'm not a cab driver, to which Malenkov venomously threw: "You are completely clean with us, Comrade Khrushchev", and later added: "You know how to heat up the situation in order to remove criticism from yourself."

Malenkov was openly mocked. The middle-class party functionary Kirilenko undertook to teach one of the leaders of the Bolshevik Party the history of the party, and "voices from the audience" yelled at Malenkov: "We will remove him from the podium", "You are bustling at the Plenum", "Let the matter speak. If he turns it around, we'll pull it off the podium, "etc. But Malenkov said just "deed":

"No catastrophe will result from criticism of the actions, methods of leadership of any individual. With a different approach, one can slide into an order in which the germs of violation of the principle of collective leadership will give such shoots that it will be too late to correct them later. (Noise in the hall)

We are talking about the danger of perversion in the work of the incumbent First Secretary of the Central Committee, no matter who is in this post...

... It is impossible to allow the fate of the leadership of the party and the country ... to depend on accidents arising from the inconsistency of character and, in general, from the personal shortcomings of anyone ... "

"Voices" barked in response: "This is a declaration." And when Malenkov finished, Khrushchev, as if the agenda and the order of speeches had not been determined at the opening of the Plenum, "asked" the members of the Plenum to "suggest" him who to hear next. Previously, it was decided that Malenkov, then Molotov, then Kaganovich, etc., would be heard first. But this is how it really turned out (hereinafter - extracts from the transcript):

"H o l o s. (in "*answer*" to Khrushchev's "*question*" - S.K.). Kaganovich.

Kaganovich. They took Molotov, I'm not quite prepared.

Voice. Four days of preparation.

Kaganovich. Before I start talking, comrades, you are already interrupting. It's hard for me speak.

Voice. Don't pretend.

Kaganovich. I don't pretend...

<...>

Kaganovich. No matter how you interrogate here, no matter how noisy, I categorically deny any collusion ...

... We met in a constitutional manner, without any violation of the rules, discussed the issue ... There was a proposal to eliminate the post of First Secretary, but there was no proposal that Comrade. Khrushchev will not be in the secretariat at all...

Voice. Who gave you the right to determine the work of Comrade. Khrushchev?

Kaganovich. Any member of the Presidium of the Central Committee, any member of the Central Committee may think about the work of another comrade, and is given the right to express his opinion. I expressed my opinion. You can accept or reject... I have expressed my opinion. This is my right. I will defend this right.

... You understand, comrades, I do not understand the nature of the discussion. If you want to understand the issue, so you listen to us to the end ... "

But who in this hall needed Kaganovich's arguments? For example, Kaganovich referred to the party charter and said that if out of 11 members of the Presidium of the Central Committee, 7 members expressed a definite opinion, then is this really "gangsterism"? "Invite any lawyer," Kaganovich continued, "invite any lawyer, any reasonable person, and he will say that seven out of eleven is a majority, not a group."

In response, a certain "voice" under the approval of the audience said: "No." And why be surprised! After all, the Khrushchevites were already preparing to smear the three members of the Presidium of the Central Committee with the stigma of precisely the "anti-party group".

They interrupted Kaganovich, knocked him down, they directly insulted him with shouts: "What an impudent performance," etc., but the former Stalinist "iron" people's commissar held firm. He said this (in the transcript):

"Kaganovich ... The slogan is to catch up and overtake America. This is a big slogan. The 20th Party Congress gave instructions on this matter... But to overtake and overtake the capitalist countries requires a balance and in what sectors: to overtake and overtake in metal, to overtake and overtake in copper, to overtake and overtake in machines, to overtake and overtake in agriculture, etc. e. We have one national income, it is distributed among branches.

Kosygin. Why are you afraid?

Kaganovich. I was not afraid... If you need to move to a new position, then you need to count. Comrades, we need food, and we are slaughtering one-year-olds because there is nothing to feed them. If there were food, then we would not kill yearlings. (Laughter) (Yes, *this cry of common sense caused only laughter in those present!* - S.K.)

Voice. You don't know the business.

Kaganovich. Let's say I don't know everything...

Khrushchev. You've been talking for over an hour.

Kaganovich Of them, three-quarters of them spoke to you. I, a member of the Central Committee, for the first time act as an interrogator. I'm approaching the issue politically... Strengthen the party, don't inflame, don't set it on fire..."

And they laughed in his face and lordly cut him off. However, Kaganovich then said insightful words:

"We have debunked Stalin and imperceptibly we are debunking 30 years of our work, without wanting it, before the whole world. Now we bashfully talk about our achievements, the great struggle of our party, our people ... "

Kuusinen, by the way, argued the opposite at the Plenum - they say, "foreign comrades understood us." Kuusinen slandered the "anti-party group" and praised Khrushchev:

"They are dissatisfied with the policy that comrade. Khrushchev is making great strides both in the field of economic development of our country and in directing foreign policy... although later it turned out more than once that the initiative of comrade Khrushchev led to remarkable successes ... "

Kaganovich's speech could make any little bit think objective and unprejudiced audience, but here everything was different.

Molotov made the most weighty and worthy speech. In this hall, he was almost the only one who had every right to call himself an employee and ally of Lenin. This

besides him, but with less justification than he, only Voroshilov, Mikoyan, and perhaps even Kaganovich could say. And now Molotov, who already played no small role in the days of October, was continually insulted at the Plenum by ordinary functionaries, but he bent his line firmly and did not allow himself to be knocked down. When Khrushchevite Polyansky said about the long-standing decision of the Central Committee that this was supposedly a "piece of paper", Molotov simply answered: "I consider the decision of the Central Committee not a piece of paper" ... In response to the trick of another boor, he noted: "I consider it unnecessary to defend from such antics."

But the main thing was the essence. Molotov said (according to the transcript):

"Molotov... we certainly have the beginnings of the cult of the person of Comrade Khrushchev.

H o l o s a. This is wrong.

Molotov. We see this from various facts, and it is not I who say this, but many people say it.

H o l o s a. The people are talking.

Molotov. When all the others are silent, and one person from the members of the Presidium speaks on agriculture, and on industry, and on construction, and on finance, and on foreign policy, etc. (Noise in the hall) You cannot appropriate so much right, so much knowledge...

...When we elected him First Secretary, I thought that he would be the same person he was before he was appointed First Secretary. Things didn't work out that way, and the further, the more."

Molotov talked a lot, convincingly, and about many things. Minister of Agriculture Benediktov and Minister of Grain Products Korniets reproached Molotov for counteracting Khrushchev's "virgin" adventure, but Molotov was right - it was necessary to invest in the Non-Black Earth region, and have virgin lands in a strategic reserve.

Molotov, showing the adventurism of the Khrushchevites in planning, threw out: "The history of the party did not begin with the 20th Party Congress," to which he received in response from an anonymous "voice" an impudent remark: "Why are you reading a political letter to us?"

Molotov spoke for a long time, and it was clear that this was both his political confession and a public political testament. He talked about how stupid it is to behave in such a way that as a result the Western world unites around the United States. He said that we must keep our brand high in foreign policy. He struck at the root of evil when he declared that the organs of Soviet power were belittled in comparison with the party ones (this already worried Stalin).

Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov talked about a lot of things, and even Shepilov, who "joined them," also spoke about the matter. In particular, and so:

"One can say that one is a "careerist", the other is "strives to power", but it cannot be imagined that such a large number of people (in the *Presidium of the Central Committee*. - S.K.) responsible, including those with half a century of experience, are striving for power. I spoke at the Presidium about this. I personally am not offended by anything, but I have been advanced for two hundred years ahead: I have been given so many ranks, orders ... "

Khrushchevite Pospelov immediately asked him: "You say that you are not offended, but why do you treat Comrade Khrushchev like that? This is a provocation". However, Shepilov did not succumb to Pospelov's provocation and cut him off: "I spoke about the shortcomings that worry us."

Alas, the Khrushchev-style Central Committee of the CPSU was no longer worried about the shortcomings hindering the development of the USSR, and not the fate of the USSR - most members of the Khrushchev Central Committee were truly interested only in their own petty fate.

The Extraordinary 21st Congress of the CPSU, which took place from January 27 to February 5, 1959, turned into a new act of triumph for the degenerates and an official mockery of the memory of Stalin and the scientific approach to planning the country's future.

It was decided to hold the next, XXII Congress of the CPSU in 1961, and this congress became the apotheosis, in the apt expression of Molotov, Khrushchev's "cult of the person". Then it was

a decision was made to remove Stalin's sarcophagus from the Mausoleum. The sarcophagus with Stalin's body was taken out, and Stalin's hasty nighttime burial at the Kremlin wall became a distant harbinger of the funeral of the State created under his leadership.

However, *the person* had not so much time left for his political courage - only until 1964. The "epoch" of Brezhnev's "cult of the person" was approaching. And over the outwardly boundless prospects of the USSR in the 60s and 70s, clouds began to gather, which appeared in our political firmament back in the 50s.

Much later, the Lube group will sing:

Ah, the sixties
Proud, chubby...

Yes, in the "Khrushchev" "pot-bellied" 50s and 60s, the peoples of the USSR had many reasons to be proud: the first satellite, the world's first nuclear power plant and the Lenin nuclear icebreaker, the first cosmonaut, the first Soviet Antarctic expeditions, the first Soviet victories at the Olympic Games ...

And even in the field of ballet, we were then indeed "ahead of the rest."

However - not only in the field of ballet.

However, in general, the Soviet Union by the end of Khrushchev's stay in the highest government posts (since 1958, he also made himself the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR) was becoming more and more "corn" in nature. It was precisely "corn", because what was later called Khrushchev's "voluntarism" and which in reality was not so much the result of Khrushchev's actions as the result of his skillful manipulation, was most concentrated in Khrushchev's "corn" adventure. Even the current young generations of "Russians" at least a little, but have heard a lot about this "corn" "epopee".

Khrushchev picked up his passion for corn during a visit to the United States in September 1959. Then Khrushchev visited the millionaire farmer Gareth in Iowa, and Khrushchev's son-in-law Adjubej and company in the book "Face to Face with America" described this *historic* visit as follows:

"On September 23, Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev got up early to go to visit the farmer Roswell Gareth ...

... Iowa appeared before us in a beautiful dress of early autumn. Light gilding the trees are showered, the yellowed cornfields are fanned by a fresh breeze.

"The corn is gaining strength like a freight train going downhill," our driver repeated a favorite phrase of the Iowans.

Farmers have not yet begun to harvest corn for grain, only some of them mowed her for silo...

The cornfields were plowed..."

And so on - from page 336 to page 360, where it was reported that "Soviet people know Nikita Sergeevich as the greatest connoisseur of agriculture," but American correspondents for the first time observed him in this capacity and were amazed that such -de "a connoisseur (*well, well*. - S.K.) of political, social, economic issues" acts "as the finest (yeah, *where it is thin, it breaks there*. - S.K.) specialist in agricultural production, operating ... with numbers, who don't even remember the professor."

The idea itself was correct - corn gives a lot of green mass for silage, and as a grain crop it is also good. On the other hand, in the USA, the same Gareth knew a lot about corn and was one of the initiators of the production of hybrid corn seeds. We had a lot to learn here (and to teach, by the way, too).

But corn is good where it grows well. The Khrushchevites, at the suggestion of the "greatest connoisseur of agriculture", rushed to plant corn crops throughout the country. Only the regions of the Far North beyond the Arctic Circle were not covered by the "corn" campaign. In Ukraine - even in Ukraine, where corn has always been grown - there was a kind of paraphrase of Taras Shevchenko's "Zapovita" on behalf of supposedly Khrushchev:

If I die, then pooh
Me in corn,
Don't forget to tweet
Buryaka on the belly.

Compared to the "corn" adventure, even the "virgin" adventure of Khrushchev paled. Although life "under Khrushchev" was generally rich in adventures of various kinds - practically in all spheres of Soviet society.

And all of them - both personally Khrushchev's home-grown simple-minded adventures without quotes, and cleverly conceived and thrown to us "adventure" of external origin - "worked" for one thing: for the future collapse of the USSR.

Chapter 9

August 23, 1991: meeting at the "atomic" hotel

And now it's time for us to return to the August days of 1991. Dear reader, I hope you remember that I arrived in Moscow in the early morning of August 22 - I have already described the impressions of that day.

Later, they began to talk about the "GKChP coup", but this was one of the manifestations of the Yeltsinoid lie. The formation of the GKChP, which included almost all the highest figures of the USSR and which did not pretend to change the form of state power and the state, does not fit the definition of a putsch, no matter how you turn it. But Yeltsin's actions were a putsch in the exact sense of the word. A putsch is a rebellion by a small group of conspirators with the aim of carrying out a coup d'état. But that is precisely what the Yeltsin group did in 1991!

On August 22, Yeltsin's anti-Soviet putsch was crowned with success, and the collapse of the USSR became, in fact, a fact. And on the morning of August 23, when I was sitting in the lobby of the main "atomic" hotel of the USSR, thinking where should I go today, a couple of my colleagues from the "atomic" Arzamas-16 appeared in the hotel. Both were part of the leading group of nuclear weapons developers, that is, the Object group of theoretical physicists.

One of them, younger, joyfully rushed to me:

- Congratulations! We won!

I shrugged.

- Who are we"?

Democracy, of course!

The second, older, did not pull him back, but was calm and, judging by his appearance, if not happy, then not at all upset.

I paused and asked:

- Where did you come?

- In GURVO ...

GURVO is not the headquarters of the "Sakharov" "interregional" group of deputies of the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR, not a "democratic" "cabal", it is the Main Directorate of Missile Weapons. And so, the two seconded to the GURVO, undoubtedly professionally competent people, who had been working unsuccessfully all their lives to ensure the security of the USSR, absolutely did not understand that from that moment on, the security of the USSR would only decrease, and the fate of the USSR would now be in question. They

they did not understand this, and one even rejoiced at it.

Alas, it turned out that professional high intelligence even among scientists is not a guarantee of adequate political intelligence in them.

Sad but true.

I could not stand it and very angrily said:

- Guys! Why did you come to GURVO? You can turn around and go back...

Nuclear weapons are necessary for a great power, and we are no longer a great power!

The younger one actively protested, but I waved my hand and set off again to walk around Moscow.

The impressions of the second day were no more joyous than those of the first day. Closer to dinner, I found myself in the office of one of the then ideologists of the newspaper Sovetskaya Rossiya, Eduard Fyodorovich Volodin, who had been a professor at the Academy of Social Sciences under the Central Committee of the CPSU for a long time. I have known the late Volodin since 1990. Even then, he was leaning towards a kind of "Orthodox socialism," which both irritated and amused me. However, now I have come to him in the hope that at least now he will understand that the only salvation of Russia is not in priestly banners, but in the Red Banner.

When I entered, Volodin was talking to someone on the phone and, waving his hand to me, inviting me to sit down, continued the conversation. Five minutes passed, ten, twenty, thirty, and he patiently listened to the interlocutor, sometimes inserting phrases and the conversation did not turn off. I decided to myself that if he wasn't done in five, well, ten minutes, I would just get up and leave. But after two or three minutes he said goodbye, hung up the phone and explained in an apologetic tone:

- Sorry, it was Valentina Stepanovna Grizodubova who called. Worried, wanted speak out.

My irritation immediately disappeared - Grizodubova is Grizodubova! The legendary Stalinist pilot-record holder, who made 200 sorties during the war, colonel, Hero of the Soviet Union and Hero of Socialist Labor, she was a person beyond criticism for me. However, unprecedented times were advancing in the country, and I noticed:

- Why didn't you tell her that she should have gathered her fighting friends with the stars of Heroes and publicly slapped this "Yeltsin crow" Shaposhnikov? Maybe it would work.

"Well, why are you making claims against the old man," Volodin waved him off. - Here you need stronger hands than Valentina Stepanovna's, and not for a slap in the face.

"So what's the deal?" What is not found? I asked.

Volodin just shrugged.

A personally honest person, he, alas, himself was one of those who misunderstood the situation, and it was clear that the moment of truth was coming for him only now and that he was not very ready for it. But he was a man with a fundamental, it would seem, socio-political training. What could be expected from others?

Looking ahead, I will say that at the beginning of September 1991, by the will of fate, I ended up in one very "leading" office, the owner of which really managed big things and big teams. And from a completely confidential conversation with him, I was surprised to understand that he, a Soviet and statesman by nature, is politically blind and instead of bitter truths, he still lives on illusions.

What was there to blame the heroine of the Stalin era, Valentina Grizodubova, who turned 80 in 1991 (two years later, in 1993, she died). Although her slap in the face could, perhaps, the same Shaposhnikov, who was appointed Minister of Defense of the USSR on August 23, 1991, and sober up.

And yet, maybe not. Types like this smiling opportunist (or maybe worse), as they say, you can't get out of a cannon. However, a few words about this renegade must be said - to clarify the minds.

Yevgeny Shaposhnikov was not even fifty years old in 1991 - he was born in February 1942. Father, a simple worker, sergeant of the Red Army, died in April 1945 in

East Prussia. The son graduated from the Kharkov Higher Military Aviation Pilot School named after S. I. Gritsevets in 1963 and joined the ranks of the CPSU in the same year. Then - the usual "ladder": pilot, senior pilot, flight commander, deputy commander and ...

And here in his biography a non-standard "squiggle" turned out - from deputy squadron commanders Shaposhnikov immediately becomes deputy regiment commander, but - not in flight, but in *the political* part.

Actually, in those years, this happened most often not with convinced communists, but with convinced careerists. And the political "squiggle" was a success, turning into a zigzag of luck - two years later Shaposhnikov became the commander of the regiment, and then "flooded" - in the initial "Gorbachev" 1985, at the age of forty-three, he was appointed commander of the Air Force of the Odessa Military District and in July 1990 - Commander-in-Chief of the Air Force and Deputy Minister of Defense of the USSR.

I will not guess whether Shaposhnikov, who served in Germany from 1969 to 1975, was pre-selected and processed by agents of Western influence, or he was an ordinary self-seeker who knows how to keep his nose to the wind and therefore suits agents of influence without direct recruitment. But one way or another, the "Marshal" of Aviation Shaposhnikov (he was given this title on August 26, 1991) was a quite typical representative of the Soviet "elite" of the 1985-1991 model. Complete unscrupulousness, complete oblivion of the oath and an undoubted desire to stay on the surface at any cost - even at the cost of turning into complete, sorry, shit.

Shaposhnikov was appointed Minister of Defense of the USSR on August 23, 1991, and on the same day he publicly announced his withdrawal from the CPSU, since the army should be outside political movements. And in his first interview as a minister, the son of a deceased front-line soldier, raised by the Soviet government to heavenly heights, but despising the cause of his father, said: "As long as I am the Minister of Defense, the Soviet Army will never turn its weapon against its people."

This renegade from the marshal's shoulder straps, it seems, included among the people Gorbachev and the Gorbachevs, Yeltsin and the Yeltsinoids, as well as "cooperators", privatizers, the founders of various LLCs and JSC "MMM" who went crazy from permissiveness "intellectuals" and all sorts of nationalists and separatists.

On the other hand, at the time of the Yeltsin putsch, Shaposhnikov, according to the author of biographical dictionaries Nikolai Zenkovich, declared that he was ready to send a squadron of bombers to the Kremlin in order to destroy the GKChP.

Fun fact...

On the other hand, when on November 8, 1991, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Russia discussed the issue of introducing a state of emergency in Chechnya, Shaposhnikov spoke out against it and said: "We will not bomb."

The fact is also interesting. Especially taking into account the fact that, according to some reports, Shaposhnikov in April 1992 was fussing about transferring weapons and military equipment to Dudayev "at the residual value."

Nikolai Zenkovich writes that Shaposhnikov was "the most smiling Soviet (*more precisely, anti-Soviet*. - S.K.) Minister of Defense", that he loved social events and willingly gave interviews, especially to young and beautiful journalists.

On December 30, 1991, Shaposhnikov ceased to be the Minister of Defense of the USSR due to the illegal liquidation of the USSR and moved to the ephemeral chair of the "commander-in-chief" of the "Armed Forces of the CIS", without preventing the defeat of the Soviet Army and pulling it apart among the "national" "barns". Then he hung out either in Yeltsin's or in Putin's "power structures" - an option for Gorbachev's "elite" is quite common.

I dwelled on the colorless "person" of Shaposhnikov in such detail because, on the one hand, it was necessary to give a more detailed portrait of at least one of the top murderers of the USSR, and on the other hand, this is a portrait of someone who carries, perhaps, the main

personal responsibility for the murder of the USSR.

After all, "Marshal" Shaposhnikov was a responsible member of the last composition of the Soviet government and was obliged, at least in the fall of 1991, to fulfill his constitutional duty and, on behalf of the Soviet government, raise the troops entrusted to him to defend the dying constitutional *order*.

Didn't pick it up.

Killed since August 22, 1991, the Soviet Union still did not realize that its they kill him, but they killed him - even before August 22.

So, on July 23, 1991, Gorbachev agreed with the leaders of 9 union republics on the draft of a new, disintegrating, "Union Treaty", the signing of which was scheduled for August 20, 1991.

And two days later, by the way, on July 25, 1991, less than a month before the Yeltsin coup, in Moscow, at the ninety-eighth year of his life, the last member of the Stalinist "team" - Lazar Moiseevich Kaganovich, one of the founders of the USSR, died.

Kaganovich experienced and accomplished a lot in his life, but I don't know if he was aware in his last days that he and his comrades made a fatal mistake, succumbing to Khrushchev's provocation after Stalin's death and giving Lavrenty Beria to the Khrushchevites for slaughter? After all, if not for this, everything could have been different for Beria, and for Kaganovich, and for his comrades, and most importantly, for the entire USSR and its peoples.

Whether Kaganovich understood this, I do not know. And no one can answer this question.

By the way: a week after the death of Kaganovich, on July 31, 1991, Gorbachev and US President George W. Bush signed in Moscow the unequal, treacherous START-1 treaty on the reduction of strategic arms.

Bush and his "team" flew to Moscow at the end of July for a final inspection of the readiness of Moscow's puppeteers and puppeteers for the forthcoming final acts of collapse. Meetings between Gorbachev and Bush, a career intelligence officer, took place "face to face" or in an extremely narrow circle.

Yes, the fact of Bush's arrival in that situation was ominous in itself, and a month after the appearance of top Americans in the capital of the USSR, this fact became especially revealing. But who needed revelations then? At the end of August 1991, confusion and absurdity triumphed in the minds.

On August 23, 1991, I was sitting in the office of Professor Volodin and, talking with him, I was surprised to find that he was not ready for such events either, although he should have been ... However, I already wrote about this.

Not very appetizing kitchen smells came into the office - Eduard Fedorovich, the recent "ideologist" of "Soviet Russia", was moved from a good office next to the editor-in-chief to a run-down corridor next to the back of the dining room.

This also spoke of something, including the fact that our conversation now, in fact, cannot but be meaningless, primarily because it cannot be productive. And I began to "fold" it.

Saying goodbye to Professor Volodin and dropping in on a couple of acquaintances, I I finally realized that there was nothing for me to do in Moscow, there was no need to talk with anyone and there was no need.

Of course, in the capital of the USSR and at the end of August 1991 there were tens, if not hundreds of thousands, and even, perhaps, millions of people who were not happy about what had happened, were discouraged, confused, looked to the future with anxiety (as it quickly turned out, quite justified) and remained Soviet people in spirit and thoughts. But all of them in those days turned out to be disunited, unorganized, devoid of leadership.

If in Moscow then there was a group of military men, security officers and leaders of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, to which the leaders of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, directors of large enterprises and party workers who remained devoted to socialism would join (there were such people in Moscow then, starting with the first secretary of the Moscow City Committee Yuri Prokofiev, who warned Gorbachev about it shortly before the disaster), then everything could have gone differently.

It could!

After all, then, after the failure of the State Emergency Committee and the success of the Yeltsin coup, it should have become more or less clear to a more or less politically literate person that from now on the USSR, Soviet Russia, has only two ways: either to go towards the increasing destruction of everything that it has achieved over decades persistent development, or - to shake things up, gather strength, stop the impending catastrophe and, taking into account all the mistakes and miscalculations, go further along the path of creating a smart and kind community of people.

In fact, on August 22, 1991, Russia found itself in the same systemic position in which it found itself half a century ago - on June 22, 1941. As then, the country was subjected to a sudden, insidious attack, as then, it immediately became clear that Russia was in mortal danger, as then, at first, many were seized by confusion, as then, widespread betrayal was revealed at different levels of society - from the highest to private...

However, then, in 1941, not everyone was confused and unsettled. Then the catastrophe forced all honest, all healthy forces of Soviet society to quickly mobilize - spiritually and organizationally. Already on June 22, 1941, hundreds of thousands of Soviet people at the forefront of the struggle began, with their heroic resistance to the aggressor, to lay the foundation for the future Victory of 1945. And then the communists were ahead.

No, no, "democratic" scoundrels, no, no, intellectual bastards, keep your wicked grins! In 1941, this was indeed the case.

Firstly, although many units of the Red Army adequately took on the first blow of the Nazis, only the Border Troops of the NKVD showed *total* heroism and stamina. And they were *90 percent* composed of communists and Komsomol members.

Border guards have always been able to fight, and one experienced border soldier in a complex, dynamic battle without a single front line, without a clear command, was worth, perhaps, at least a dozen ordinary Red Army soldiers. And there were about a hundred thousand of them, young guys in green caps, on the western borders before the war! In the outbreak of the war, they immediately played a strategic role, without exaggeration, because they kept *for days* in an environment in which many army units rolled back after *hours*. At the same time, one cannot even say that the communist border guards were a cementing factor in the stamina of the Border Troops, because, as already mentioned, almost everyone in the Border Troops was communist. All were pupils of the new, socialist Russia, and all were worthy of it.

But not only the Border Troops turned out to be strong communists. There are harsh statistics of those days: in the second, military, half-year of 1941, 126,625 people were accepted as candidates for members of the CPSU (b) in the Red Army against 27,068 people accepted in the first, pre-war, half-year.

In my book 10 Myths About 1941, I wrote that three million communists died on the battlefields of the Great Patriotic War and that in this sense the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) during the war could be called the "party of the heroically dead", if it were not for the fact that by the end of the war there were still 3.3 million living, fighting members of the CPSU (b) in the active army - sixty percent of the active army!

The place of the dead was occupied by new front-line communists. They wrote applications for admission to the party right on the front line, and there, as you know, the communist had one "privilege" - to be the first to go on the attack.

Gorbachev's CPSU, which had 21 million members in 1985, had 15 million members by the summer of 1991. In 1941, people proudly wrote: "If I die, consider me a communist." In 1991, their children and grandchildren wrote differently: "I ask you not to consider me a member of the CPSU anymore."

And this was also the difference between 1991 and 1941.

In 1941, the country had Stalin, his "team" in Moscow and the party in the country. There was *an idea*.

And in 1991, two *dolls* were put on public display in Moscow - one with a satanic mark on the bald head and the second with a stump of a finger torn off by a grenade fragment during the robbery of an army warehouse during the war years. And around these two satanic dolls - Gorbachev and Yeltsin - their "teams" carried out a satanic action with the complete paralysis of millions of communists betrayed by their own General Secretary of the Central Committee and other party secretaries, including almost the entire Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee.

And what is sad...

An attempt to violently overthrow the existing constitutional order, as well as calls for its violent overthrow, are qualified in all countries as the gravest state crime.

And what about the calls and actions for the forcible *preservation* of the existing constitutional order?

Indeed, from any point of view - constitutional, legal, civil, moral - such calls and actions can be and should be qualified not only as the legal right of citizens, but also as their holy, direct civic *duty* !

By the autumn of 1991, it could not but become completely clear to everyone that the top leadership of the USSR was betraying it, destroying it and openly dismantling the *constitutional* socialist system.

Therefore, any division commander who, say, in August or at least in September 1991, would uncover the battle flag of the division and go on the attack *for our Soviet Motherland* to the Gorbachev Kremlin or the Yeltsin White House, would only be fulfilling his *constitutional duty* and his obligations before the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, taken by him *under the Military Oath*.

Well, let it not be the division commander - at this level, decide on a speech, oh how difficult, and success is problematic. But, say, army commanders?

Or the commanders of the military districts?

Or - commanders of the types and types of troops of the Armed Forces of the USSR?

Finally, the highest marshals and generals from the USSR Ministry of Defense and the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, as well as the leadership of the USSR State Security Committee?

However, no one, none of those who, due to their high position in the USSR and due to their capabilities, *could*, began to act. But all of them were criminally inactive at the very time when the enemies of Russia were committing frankly criminal and unconstitutional actions.

Ugh!

Yes, none of those elevated by the Soviet government to social heights ever dared, did not dare to speak in word and deed in defense of the current Constitution of the USSR. But those who were responsible to the Motherland *by oath*, only in Moscow and the Moscow region were more than one million. But they were obliged to act in defense of the socialist Fatherland on the orders of the Soviet government.

But the order never came. Even from the GKChP.

I couldn't give orders, and I couldn't even get close to those who were authorized to give them. I differed from tens of millions of my fellow citizens only in that I was clearly aware that the death of Russia was beginning.

At the same time, by the end of my second day in Moscow, I was fed up with the pictures of the "Yeltsin revolution" and realized that there was no point in staying in Moscow, which was turning into a den of Satan. I went to the Kazansky railway station, exchanged tomorrow's ticket for today's one, and on the evening of August 23 I left for home.

My heart was empty and vile, but at that time I still hoped that the healthy forces of society (they could not exist in society!) would be able to quickly organize themselves and overcome the crisis. Then I still hoped for the Soviet "elite" and did not yet know that by the summer of 1991, almost without exception, it would turn out to be treacherous.

However, my illusions dissipated quickly, and soon I fully realized that the systemic, invisible aggression against the USSR, which began on August 22, 1991, had been prepared for a long time and turned out to be prepared much more thoroughly than the direct aggression against the USSR that began on June 22, 1941 was prepared. of the year.

The crisis of June 1941 was overcome by the end of the year, partly because in the USSR, by the beginning of the war, the potential "fifth column" at all levels of Soviet society had been basically eliminated. The significance of this fact was later recognized both in the USA and in the Third Reich (up to Hitler).

And the crisis of August 1991 could not be overcome, among other things, because it was created by a powerful "fifth column" at the highest levels of Soviet society.

I have already spoken here more than once about this most important factor in the collapse of the USSR, and I consider it useful to once again take a retrospective look at the situation that gradually led us to the first Yeltsin coup in the summer of 1991.

Chapter 10

Historical digression No. 2: between the voluntarism of the 20th century and the insanity of the 21st century

First, however, a small digression - about a certain operation "Golgotha" ...

The reality of the early 90s in the collapsing USSR was so *unreal*, so psychologically it did not fit into any logical schemes - even into the scheme of the deliberate murder of the USSR, that the thought involuntarily occurred to me that, perhaps, some far-sighted forces in the capital The "top", seeing that many in the country look enviously towards the "charms" of the Western world, decided to drag the people through the dirt and stink of the "capitalist experiment" and develop for the future among the Soviet people a strong social immunity to such "charms".

However, of course, I understood that such a "guess" could not be seriously considered and expressed it to my colleagues as a sad joke. Therefore, I was only sadly amused by the publication in one of the tabloid Moscow publications (perhaps it was "Top Secret") of a "memoir" by a certain KGB colonel Lyubimov called "Operation Golgotha", which claimed that the author was allegedly one of the developers of the operation, meaning which was close to my playful version. The younger comrade, who brought this "memoir" to work, delightedly told me: "Listen, you were right!"

But I immediately cooled it down - the provocative and mocking essence of the "memoir" became clear to me even before reading it, immediately after getting to know the title. Alas, some forces really led and brought Russia to social Golgotha, but the goal was not the resurrection of Russia, but her martyrdom. And our way of the cross began a long time ago.

Yes, if you look carefully and thoughtfully at the history of Russia over the past fifty years, you can see that in a sense this period, with all the differences in its individual phases, is inextricably united by one essential feature.

Outwardly, at first glance, Khrushchev's "voluntarism", Brezhnev's "stagnation", Andropov's and Chernenko's "hearse races", Gorbachev's "perestroika", Yeltsin's "democratization" and "parade of sovereignties" and, finally, Putin-Medvedev's "restructuring" and "modernization are completely different - and the country was different every time, and the political system over these fifty years has changed antagonistically, however ... However, there is something in common - in these last fifty years, the USSR and then the Russian Federation more and more fell under the rule of external hostile state power in the USSR and then in the Russian Federation became less and less national in the sense that it less and less expressed the interests of the multinational Soviet people.

By the way, regarding the "Soviet people", the intelligentsia "wise men" can hold back the irony. Not an instructor of the Central Committee of the CPSU, but Anton Ivanovich Denikin, in his Notes of a Russian Officer, expressed the idea that at the beginning of the 20th century, finally

the process of rapid formation of the Russian people headed by the Russian people was outlined. In a systemic sense, Denikin's concept of "Russian people" was equivalent to the concept of "Soviet people", so the latter concept is not an invention of "soviet" agitprop.

However, I will return to the topic of the chapter and say that from the "voluntarism" of Khrushchev with his "corn" there is an unbreakable thread to the "modernization" of Medvedev with his "Skolkovo". Adventuristic, destructive and anti-national, both. You can say this: *"Skolkovo of Medvedev and Putin is Khrushchev's 'corn'". And both of these "epochal" adventures have transatlantic origins.*

Therefore, to me, dear reader, it seems to me not only useful, but "iron" necessary to take another direct historical digression, which in fact will be an analysis not so much of our past as of our present.

So let's start with...

On October 14, 1964, the Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU released Khrushchev from the duties of the 1st Secretary of the Central Committee and removed him from the Presidium of the Central Committee - "Nikita" was resigned "outright".

Brezhnev was elected the new First (since 1966 - General) Secretary of the Central Committee, Kosygin headed the Council of Ministers, and Podgorny - the Supreme Soviet of the USSR instead of Brezhnev.

Today, having the opportunity to look back on what happened then, we can confidently state that the removal of Khrushchev and his replacement by the duumvirate of Brezhnev and Kosygin did not improve the situation. On the contrary, the very next year after the fall of Khrushchev, the economic reform of 1965 created systemic conditions for the gradual degradation of socialism and, as a result, the fall of the USSR.

I have already written about this more than once, but it does not hurt to repeat what is said below once again. After all, the Soviet Union then stepped on the "rake" for the first time, which we risk stepping on again – even after restoring socialism – if we do not understand what happened in the USSR in 1965.

But the fact is that in 1965 the basic economic law of socialism was actually replaced in the USSR by the basic economic law of capitalism. And the substitution was made so cleverly that it has not been discovered so far. Without understanding the essence of the substitution, it is impossible to fully and fully understand why the Soviet Union fell?

One of Stalin's philosophical discoveries was the idea that the economic social laws in those periods while they are in effect are as unshakable as the laws of nature. *Stalin realized that social laws reflect objective processes that occur independently of the will of people in society, just as the laws of nature reflect objective processes that occur independently of the will of people in nature.*

Socialism cannot be built only on the desire to build it. It is necessary to know the laws of the new system in order to build it, develop it and strengthen it, and not destroy it.

The peculiarity of the laws of political economy, Stalin wrote, is that "its laws, unlike the laws of natural science, are short-lived", that they "are in force for a certain historical period, after which ... they give way to new laws."

But while they are in effect, they cannot be bypassed and cannot be canceled - how can this be done with legal laws, Stalin warned. At the same time, Stalin formulated both the basic economic law of capitalism and the basic economic law of socialism:

"The main features and requirements of the basic economic law of modern capitalism could be formulated in approximately the following way (*note how accurate Stalin is in formulating thoughts, which is typical only for true scientists.* –

S.K.): ensuring the maximum capitalist *profit* ...

Essential Features and Requirements of the Fundamental Economic Law of Socialism

could be formulated roughly as follows: ensuring maximum satisfaction of the constantly growing material and *cultural* needs of the whole society through *the continuous* growth and improvement of socialist production *on the basis of higher technology*.

The laws of nature can, of course, be ignored. It is possible to despise the law of universal gravitation and step into the abyss, but the result will be deplorable. Public economic laws, if ignored, take revenge on violators as cruelly as the laws of nature.

Stalin understood that the economy cannot work at a loss, but correctly noted that only such an economy can be healthy, which does not increase profits, but reduces the *cost* of production. And an economically justified cost reduction is impossible without the introduction of new, "higher" technology, a reduction in energy intensity, material intensity, and labor intensity per unit of output.

If the cost price has decreased, it is possible to reduce the retail price - if our goal is not to make a profit for the owner, but to increase the ability of the worker to purchase products of production. And then, even with the same wages, if the labor expended has not increased, the worker will be able to buy more and more often, to afford more. As the material wealth of a society grows, so can wages—without any inflation.

Moreover, in accordance with the basic law of socialism, discovered by Stalin, the new person will feel the need to expand not so much the material as the spiritual consumption of the values of life. Without this, there can be no development
socialism.

But in 1965, an economic reform began, which was named after Kosygin. The September Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU in 1965 declared that it was necessary "... to improve the use of such important economic levers as profit, price, premium, credit."

Making profit, and not a comprehensively developed person, the main goal of economic activity in the USSR, the initiators of the economic reform of 1965 ignored the basic economic law of socialism. And thus systematically laid the trend of the death of socialism. After all, the production of profit is the economic law of capitalism, and the fact that this profit was called "socialist" by the initiators of the reform is the essence of the matter.

did not change.

There is no doubt that the huge increase in the volume of economic activity of Soviet society urgently demanded a radical reform of planning and the provision of greater freedom for enterprises to manage. But the emphasis in planning and evaluating the results of the work of production teams had to be placed on reducing costs and material consumption, as well as on the range of products. In reality, however, profits and "growing" reigned in the economy of the USSR...

By the way, just the first approach lay in line with the main economic law of socialism, which postulated the continuous improvement of socialist production *on the basis of higher technology*. The latter concept, by the way, included not only automation, but also the computerization of economic management, which by the beginning of the 60s was becoming quite a real and near prospect. The widespread introduction of electronic computing technology, combined with effective mathematical programming (in which the USSR was then the leader), created enormous creative opportunities for the USSR. But therefore, "agents of influence" buried all such plans -

in return, their Soviet society received the "Kosygin economic reform" of 1965.

The "shadow" ideologist (or rather, a convenient "expert screen") of the "Kosygin reforms" was chosen as an ordinary Kharkov professor Yevsey Lieberman, who was followed by a number of "... mans" on both sides of the USSR state border. And this "reform" with a purely

scientific point of view, immutably, with the inexorability of the laws of nature, laid the methodological foundations for the destruction of Man in the average Soviet person and created the conditions for a greater awakening in each subsequent generation of formally Soviet people of capitalist greed.

If capitalism ignores its fundamental law and stops focusing on profit, it will not be able to exist as capitalism and will turn into its opposite - socialism. But socialism, if it ignores its fundamental law and stops putting the needs of a comprehensively developed person at the forefront, will also not be able to exist as socialism and will turn into its opposite - into

capitalism.

Which is what actually happened.

In addition to the systemic sabotage against socialism in the USSR, the subjective factor of the decomposition and destruction of socialism was gradually intensifying - the cadres of "agents of influence" and renegades. But in the mid-60s, no one even knew about it. Soviet society was in a state of euphoria from the overthrow of "Nikita" and its replacement by people who gave the impression of professionals, and even seemed to be professionals.

There were many hopes: Brezhnev, at the time of his election as the First Secretary of the Central Committee instead of Khrushchev, was not even fifty-eight years old, Kosygin, who became Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR instead of Khrushchev, turned exactly sixty.

Most importantly, they were emphatically businesslike and did not stick themselves out.

Kosygin was in the front ranks of Stalin's employees already in the 40s, since 1948 he was a member of the Stalinist Politburo of the Central Committee, and under Khrushchev he was pushed back precisely because of his managerial competence (politically, Kosygin, it should be noted, turned out to be rather weak).

Brezhnev was also known as a Stalinist nominee. Already in July 1950, the forty-four-year-old Brezhnev, being the 1st secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (b) of Moldova, came to the attention of Stalin, who noted the vigor of "this handsome Moldavian" ... In October 1952, the "Moldovan" was elected secretary of the Union Central Committee and a candidate member the last Stalinist Politburo - the Presidium of the Central Committee is no longer the CPSU (b), but the CPSU.

However, after the death of Stalin, Brezhnev is also relegated to the background. From August 1955 he was the 1st secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan, and in February 1956 he was returned to Moscow as the secretary of the Central Committee. However, in May 1960, the level of Brezhnev's influence was reduced by "shock sublimation", transplanted into the honorary, but little meaning chair of the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

Nevertheless, in 1963, in parallel, he again became secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, and soon took an active part in preparing the removal of Khrushchev, the main organizer of which was the secretary of the Central Committee, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, recent chairman of the KGB Alexander Shelepin, "iron Shurik".

Brezhnev "started" as head of the USSR vigorously and not bad. Thus, in the early 1990s, the scientific director of the oldest Soviet nuclear weapons center at Arzamas-16, academician Yuliy Borisovich Khariton, answering the question of the writer Vladimir Gubarev about what had changed with the collapse of the USSR, answered: "What has changed? The attitude towards us has changed. Previously, the General Secretary called me once a month, the Secretary of the Central Committee for Defense Affairs - once a week, but Serbin - the head of the defense department of the Central Committee - every day"...

The surname of the General Secretary was not named, but it was clear that Brezhnev was meant, because Gorbachev - formally the same General Secretary and Chairman of the USSR Defense Council as Brezhnev - neglected defense issues so openly that he even ignored Khariton's written appeals. In the "perestroika" years, the oldest "atomic" academician wrote a letter to Gorbachev, where he insisted on a meeting with the country's leading weapons manufacturers, formulated already at that time the sore problems of the nuclear weapons complex, stated that "the issue of full-scale nuclear weapons is extremely important.

tests," and explained: "These tests for nuclear weapons are a key step in confirming all of its technical characteristics: combat effectiveness, reliability and safety."

The answer was Gorbachev's idea of a "nuclear-free world by the year 2000" and unilateral moratoriums on nuclear tests, which marked the beginning of the degradation of weapons work.

Brezhnev, like all people of his generation, was very attentive to ensuring the country's military security and understood defense issues. Moreover, he could correctly build military-technical priorities and support the right ideas. Without much pomp, without the sound of shoes on the UN rostrum (as Khrushchev did), Brezhnev in a very short time managed to virtually eliminate the threat of a large-scale war not only against Russia, but in the whole world. To this day, grandmothers sigh: "If only there were no war ..." But for the fact that there is no "war" and - if Russia maintains an effective nuclear missile complex - there will not be, the country should thank Brezhnev, not least. Having done a lot back in the fifties for the Soviet space, having received the title of Hero of Socialist Labor in 1961 in the "clip" of those awarded on the occasion of the success of Gagarin's flight, he did not lose sight of the "nuclear" aspect of defense. That's why he called Khariton at Arzamas-16 every month.

However, Brezhnev could not keep up with events and faces. By the 60th anniversary, he receives the first Star of the Hero of the Soviet Union, having managed to harvest four such Stars by the day of his death, along with the star of the Marshal of the Soviet Union and the Order of Victory, which was not received according to the statute of the order.

At the age of seventy-one - in 1977 - Brezhnev was again "assigned" also the "title" of the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and five years later, on the Day of the Soviet Police on November 10, 1982, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev died and was buried on Red Square.

Brezhnev's path to supreme power in the world's second superpower ran not through exile and underground, not through deprivation and struggle with the oppositionists - like Lenin and Stalin did. The Brezhnev generation came to serious posts in the conditions of the already established party-state system, and even the military period of their career passed within the framework of a fairly "apparatus" one. There is a photo of the operational group of the Military Council of the Southern Front in 1942. Brezhnev's friend Konstantin Grusheva is sitting in the center with two major's "sleepers" in his buttonholes... Nikolai Shchelokov is standing with the captain's "sleepers". Colonel Brezhnev then had four of them, but both he and his comrades from pre-war Dnepropetrovsk, who entered much later into the inner circle of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU L.I. Brezhnev, were no longer genuine politicians, but were sophisticated "apparatchiks".

Even at the dawn of Soviet power, Lenin wrote to Deputy Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars Tsyurupa: "... All of us drowned in the lousy bureaucracy of the "departments" ... Great authority, intelligence, and a hand are needed for the daily struggle against this. Departments - g ... but; decrees - g ... but. Looking for people, checking work - that's all ... "

Possessing a completely average mind and far from a hard hand, having found himself at the pinnacle of immense power, Brezhnev did not begin to fight this "g ...", but gradually swam in his specific, foul-smelling stream. A retired member of the Politburo, Mazurov, once admitted to Molotov that he left because he "did not want to be responsible for the outrages that were happening under Brezhnev."

Molotov himself - in response to the remark of the poet Felix Chuev that "the Brezhnev period slowed us down a lot" - said: "Yes, he definitely slowed down," and added: "Khrushchevism was repeated under Brezhnev."

Alas, this is so... And the situation even got worse - despite all the visible digital successes of the Brezhnev-style USSR. There were successes, but they could have been qualitatively more significant ... After all, even Stalin did not have Brezhnev's capabilities, because the Generalissimo of the USSR did not have the power that was at his disposal

Brezhnev!

And it was not just a powerful, but also a self-sufficient and comprehensively developed country, where, having never heard of the WTO and other "charms" of "civilization", they made rockets, conquered the Yenisei, had first-class ballet and science and an average life expectancy of the population under 70 years.

Alas, from the very beginning of his senior leadership, Leonid Ilyich and his closest "team" had neither bright ideas nor great aspirations worthy of the Power they headed. Everything seemed to go by itself... The country reached such milestones from which it was possible to go by leaps and bounds into a great and glorious future, leading all healthy

the forces of the planet, but...

But the Brezhnev era - with all its potential power - could not consolidate the successes of previous generations. And the positive social derivative from the collective efforts of the healthy part of Soviet society no longer blocked the negative derivative from the negative tendencies of the "Brezhnevism".

Why it happened so, I will say later - in due time and in due place. But, among other things, the increasingly powerful and nimble "fifth column" also played its role here. When the coffin with the body of Leonid Ilyich was lowered into the grave, they *dropped it!* .. It was hardly accidental. The gloomy "sign" processes were gaining strength, figures were rising, the beacon for which was the Lucifer mark on the forehead of Mikhail Gorbachev.

Yes, having lost energy and political will, formally the most powerful person in the world was increasingly turning into the most powerless, and at the same time it became decrepit - no, so far not so much the State as the creative will of the State.

Brezhnev still had the strength to sluggishly ask for his resignation, but by the combined efforts of the highest gerontocracy and the "fifth column" she was not accepted. At the same time, the image of Brezhnev was discredited on a grand scale, in which the Andropov KGB also succeeded.

During the period of leadership of the Andropov Committee, there are two events that fit well only in the version that Andropov was the "mole" of the world "elite", brought up by the "mole" Kuusinen.

The first case was the death in a car accident in 1980 of the first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belarus, a candidate member of the Politburo of the Central Committee since 1966, sixty-two-year-old Pyotr Mironovich Masharov.

Masharov was a promising candidate to replace Brezhnev. Born in 1918 into a peasant family, in 1939 he graduated from the Vitebsk Pedagogical Institute, taught physics and mathematics, skillfully fought partisans during the war, and in 1944 became a Hero of the Soviet Union. Masharov led Belarus very well (in this regard, Belarusians are generally lucky), and the circumstances of his death - no matter what is said to the contrary - point directly to Andropov.

The second case is the discrediting of another promising candidate to replace Brezhnev, the first secretary of the Leningrad Regional Committee of the CPSU, a member of the Politburo since 1976, Grigory Vasilyevich Romanov.

Romanov was born in 1923 into a Russian peasant family, at the age of fifteen he entered the Leningrad Shipbuilding College. When the war began, he went to the front as a volunteer. The shipbuilders had "armor", but the guy got his way. He fought, in 1943 he was seriously shell-shocked, in 1944 he joined the party.

After the war, he worked at the Leningrad Shipbuilding Plant named after Zhdanov, in 1953 he graduated from the evening department of the shipbuilding institute. At party work since 1954, at the age of 43 - a member of the Central Committee.

There were two kinds of legends about Romanov in St. Petersburg. Some were spread by the people, and these were honest legends, such as how Romanov came to the store incognito, was barked at by the sellers, and what came of it after an hour.

But there were also vile gossip. And it was difficult to understand who distributed them. A maybe not very much.

Romanov was finished off by the gossip that he allegedly threw the wedding of his son (or - daughter) almost in the Hermitage with the beating of the Hermitage services. The wedding really was even two. The Romanovs celebrated it modestly, in a family way, but a certain general of the Leningrad KGB, by a strange (?) coincidence (?), threw the wedding of his daughter (or - son) on the same day (!) with great fanfare, although, of course, not in the Hermitage.

And then rumors spread around Peter ...

In 1985, the Gorbachevites sent Romanov into retirement at the age of sixty-two. The reputation, tarnished by rumors among the people, excluded his election as the new General Secretary. Masherov was simply removed, with Romanov they worked more subtly.

But Romanov was an absolutely competent leader, a clever one, he would have perfectly fit into the era of Stalin, but he did not fit into the "epoch", already dug up by "moles" of various kinds and levels. However, personally Brezhnev was loyal to Romanov. And, according to French President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, he saw him as a successor.

At the very beginning of 1982, already around Brezhnev, a strange fuss begins, also, as one might assume, of "Andropov" origin. As Pribytkov, a former assistant to the penultimate Secretary General Chernenko, writes, "the supporters of the General Secretary (*Brezhnev*. - S.K.) began to die like flies : during a trifling operation in the Kremlevka, the first secretary of the Yakut regional party committee Chiryaev dies, he is immediately followed by an incomprehensible death of the first secretary from Tataria, the first secretary from Tajikistan, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Georgia..."

And on the eve of how Brezhnev finally decided to hand over the reins of government to the first secretary of Ukraine Shcherbitsky (another good candidate from the point of view of the USSR), the Secretary General himself died under more than strange circumstances.

Leonid Ilyich was a gentle and quite kind person, according to stories - he loved pigeons. He loved high-speed driving and, already supported by the arms, got behind the wheel to drive to the Crimean residence along the mountain serpentine, and even - to the horror of the guards - and with what a "breeze"!

Well, the emperors Alexander the Second and Alexander the Third were also distinguished by their personal courage ... It was only under them that the conditions were formed for the future collapse of old Russia.

Now history has repeated itself, and the coffin with the body of Brezhnev was not lowered, but *thrown* into the grave, not by any negligence.

After Brezhnev, Andropov was at the head of the USSR. He, taking into account his proximity to the Lubyanka, had even more, perhaps, unlimited possibilities for the constructive transformation of the country than Brezhnev. However, Andropov did not use them.

Why?

The water is dark in the clouds ... Or maybe, taking into account what was said earlier about the "moles" and "foremen of treason", the water is dark *and not very* ...

Adherents of Andropov refer to his illness, which did not allow him to turn around. But by the time Andropov became the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, the situation was so *stinking* and at the same time so potentially *creative* that it could be constructively "unloaded" in a matter of weeks.

For example, Napoleon Bonaparte... Goethe said that for Bonaparte power was the same as a musical instrument for a great musician - as soon as the power was in the hands of a Corsican, he immediately began to use it.

However, Napoleon quickly mastered the situation insofar as he puzzled over what should be done in France, long before he had a real opportunity to manage it. And if Andropov really wanted to strengthen the socialist system, and not its degradation, he could change the situation in, I repeat, a matter of weeks - primarily through a smart personnel policy, starting with the removal of the mediocre Gorbachev from the top leadership.

Andropov not only did not do this, but behaved in the exact opposite way. Quicker

of all, he understood that he was doomed to a quick death if only because he was preventing the future "best German" from being brought to power.

But what could Andropov do - repent? But what about the lush state funerals, a bust at the Kremlin wall, etc.?

For those who doubt whether Andropov was a sinister figure, I will additionally report that he was a great lover of Western jazz, had a rich collection of jazz records, and the walls of his apartment on Kutuzovsky Prospekt were decorated with abstract "painting". Yes, and Andropov wrote poetry, although not abstract, but they were imbued with some sort of "world sorrow" of a very cosmopolitan (yup!)

shade.

In 1983, in Jerusalem (?!), I. Zemtsov's book "Andropov" was published, where it was written about the distant successor of the knight of the revolution Dzerzhinsky as follows (I quote from O. Platonov's book "Treason", M., Algorithm, 2005, p. 103):

"...everything... it was as if intended to emphasize the two appearances of the all-Union gendarme: at home with friends he is an educated person, even refined - a treat in the continental spirit, French salads, cognac and whiskey on the table, they don't drink vodka. And at work do not exact, - service person. Among his favorite books is Salisbury's "The Gates of Hell", which features Solzhenitsyn and ... Andropov himself (who allegedly only "party duty" makes him send the writer abroad, while in his heart he "understands" him and "sympathizes" with him) ... "

By the way, about the deportation of Solzhenitsyn. It is unlikely that this next representative of the rotten "brain of the nation" would have even a tenth of the "world fame" that he had if he had not been sent abroad by Andropov.

Andropov was also (obviously by "inheritance" from Kuusinen) a patron and a kind of unspoken, according to O. Platonov, the leader of the "speechwriters" of Brezhnev and the Brezhnev Politburo: Aleksandrov-Agentov, Tsukanov, Zagladin, Arbatov Sr., Inozemtsev, Primakov, Chernyaev, Sitaryan, Bovin, Shakhnazarov and others, among whom Yakovlev, member of the Gorbachev Politburo, was especially prominent already in Gorbachev's times.

This latter, after 1991, diligently subscribed to the "civilized" Anglo-Saxon manner of "Alexander N. Yakovlev", and in this small - in its human pettiness - detail is once again visible by no means a small fact. To expose the true essence of "Alexander N." Yakovlev and others like him, this fact is important: the "foremen of treason", being at the heights of power in the USSR, dreamed of becoming "members of the free world community" just as the "Russian" emperor Peter III dreamed of being a Prussian lieutenant. For which he received a noose from the Russian guard.

Yes, there were people in Rus' once!

Andropov's task as General Secretary was not to strengthen the USSR, but to strengthen at the "top" all these agents and Yakovlevs, and above all - Gorbachev. After the "Moor"-Andropov had done his job, the "Moor" could *leave*.

And he was "gone", at the same time ensuring a short life for the penultimate before Gorbachev General Secretary Konstantin Chernenko. This one was turned into an invalid in a matter of months, and then finally finished off. The "era", later called the "era of stagnation", ended in outright insanity. Ahead was the Yeltsinoid "era" of even more vile insanity, but for now, in the short term, the "era" of Gorbachev's collapse loomed in the USSR. And she had her "moles" and her "Moors".

Then came the "epoch" at first early, and then thickened Yeltsin.

Finally, it was replaced by the "epoch" of the rise of GDP, but, alas, not of the gross domestic product, but only of Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin with his own "Moors" and "gray cardinals".

Talk about a separate "epoch" of LADIES - not beautiful ladies, but Dmitry Anatolyevich

Medvedev - is not necessary, primarily because he is just one of Putin's publications, like Putin himself - nothing more than a dispassionate publication of impulsive Yeltsin.

In the early 80s in the USSR, we had an era of *senile* insanity of power. Thirty years later, in "Rossiyanin" we again have an era of insanity of power, but already - insanity of *management*. So, by insanity in the title of this chapter, I meant not so much Brezhnevism as protracted Yeltsinism, now represented by the "tandem" of Putin and Medvedev.

From the "Khrushchev's voluntarism" of the 20th century to the total "Medvedev's" insanity of "management" and "management", to the scientific, cultural and moral degradation of the 21st century - this is the path along which the USSR was led for half a century and is now being led by "Rossiyanin)" hostile to the USSR and Russian strength.

At the same time, the connection between the dirty Khrushchev thaw and the current Time of Troubles is undeniable. This connection can be traced in many ways, including in the equally vile role of the intelligent "elite" in the ideological and intellectual disorientation of society both then and now.

And I will again touch on the topic of the "brain of the nation" so that we better understand how dangerous it is to create conditions for the emergence of an "elite" in a country where there should not be an elite by definition ...

Chapter 11

Khrushchev's "sixties" as Adventists of Yeltsin's day

The title of this chapter is, of course, a pun, and whether it is "flat" or not is not for me to judge. What is important for me is that in such a title several time layers of our history are connected at once - from Khrushchevism to Gorbachevism and Yeltsinism, including its Putin-Medvedev layer.

All these "... devilish things" differ only in the time of their existence, and in a systemic sense, as already mentioned, they have many related features. Yes, and the origin, I remind you, they have a common - *transatlantic*, like the concepts of "Pentecostals" and "Adventists", which I used for the title of the chapter.

"Pentecostals" is a savage religious sect that arose at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries in the United States and believes in the descent of the Holy Spirit on the apostles on the 50th day after the ascension of Christ. As the Oxford Illustrated Encyclopedia reports, for example, the sacraments of "Pentecostals" are characterized by slurred, incomprehensible "other" language, speech in state of ecstasy.

Seventh-day Adventists (from *Latin* adventus - incident) is another religious Protestant sect that appeared in the 30s of the XIX century, and also in the USA. In her doctrine, an important place is occupied by the theme of the second coming of Christ and his Last Judgment over the living and the dead.

As for the "sixties", this is how the "children of the Khrushchev thaw" called themselves, who came into the life of Soviet society at the turn of the 1950s and 1960s and became the result of this thaw. I will not name even the most famous "sixties" by name, but, looking back at the past, it becomes clear that the "sixties" can be defined as a savage sect of Soviet "intellectuals". With the "Pentecostals" the "Sixties" have in common, among other things, that their speeches quickly acquired a strange character and

only the "initiates" understood them.

In terms of age, the leaders of the "sixties" are mainly the generation born in the first half of the 30s. For example, the "sixties" Yevgeny Gangnus-Yevtushenko (guilty, could not resist and mentioned one name) was born in 1933. In 1991, these Soviet citizens were in their sixties, more than an active political age. And almost all the "sixties" were among the "foremen of perestroika", that is, "foremen of treason", and after the collapse of the USSR they actively supported

Yeltsin.

In the 60s, the "sixties" Bulat Okudzhava (here, again, he could not resist and mentioned another name) argued that no matter how and wherever he fell, he would still fall "on that one civilian" and they would silently bow over him " commissars in dusty helmets.

In a certain "Russian" encyclopedic dictionary, it is said about Okudzhava as follows: "In the author's songs of Okudzhava, which sounded like a moral tuning fork (*well, well*. - S.K.) in the era of stagnation, through romantically transformed pictures of everyday life, soft confidential intonation and subtle lyricism emerge firmness of ethical guidelines, impeccable fidelity to a high spiritual choice.

Well, who cares... Valentin Yumashev liked to sing the bard songs of this "moral tuning fork" with two guitars – together with one of Yeltsin's prime minister Chernomyrdin's deputies, Oleg Sysuev. On the one hand, Yumashev, Yeltsin's son-in-law and confidante, the "grandson", so to speak, of the thaw, is a farcical and monstrous figure at the same time. On the other hand, the "spiritual choice" of Okudzhava, as we see, turned out to be in good agreement with the "firmness of ethical guidelines" of the Yeltsinoids. And this is quite understandable - after the collapse of the USSR, practically not a single "bard", including Okudzhava, opposed this, but almost all of them were happy about the collapse.

In the 90s, Okudzhava (he was older - born in 1924) no longer advertised his former spiritual kinship with the Bolshevik commissars and, like other prominent "sixties", was content with handouts from the anti-Soviet state "table".

At the same time, a strange (and perhaps not very) mixture was observed in one social layer of the signs of two different transatlantic sects. The former Khrushchev "sixties" already in Gorbachev's times also turned out to be Adventists of the future Yeltsin.

The "coming" of Mikhail Gorbachev was perceived by many "sixties" as an almost religious, sacral event, and this was reminiscent of the Adventist faith in the coming of the Messiah. This "religious" ecstasy reached its peak with the bringing to the political stage of the "catastrophe" of Boris Yeltsin.

But at the time of the cataclysmic "perestroika", the classic "sixties", as already mentioned, were in their sixties, or even over sixty, and they needed young replenishment so that the passionately awaited coming of Yeltsin would become a fact. And young "wine" was poured into the old "skins" - the "sixties" were replaced by their "children", just at the time of the Khrushchev thaw - in the late 50s - early 60s -

and born.

So, for example, Boris Nemtsov, the first Yeltsin governor of the Nizhny Novgorod region, was born in 1959, Sergei Kiriyenko-Israïtel, a master of defaults, in 1962, Yeltsin's and Putin's accomplice in the leadership of the presidential administration, Vladislav Surkov, in 1964, etc.

Then even younger shoots went "into power". The country more and more found itself under the yoke of the most terrifying, downright zoological incompetence, and the former "sixties" who retrained as Adventists of the Yeltsin day kept playing the same chorus to TV viewers, radio listeners and readers: "GULAG, GULAG, GULAG, Stalin is a tyrant."

They play this "hurdy-gurdy" to this day - mixed with bard songs discounted by history.

But why are they so spiteful towards their own history, towards their own country, towards the fate of their own people? In the not bad Soviet film "Property of the Republic", the bandit leader "from the intelligentsia" declares: "There is no greater pleasure for an intelligent person than to destroy a world masterpiece."

Well, it looks like it is! The USSR as a phenomenon of world history was a true civilizational masterpiece, and it was for

"intelligent people" enjoyment.

More than a hundred years ago, Lenin, referring to the intelligentsia of Tsarist Russia, wrote:

The transitional, unstable, contradictory position of the social stratum under consideration is reflected in the fact that among it those half-hearted, eclectic views, that hodgepodge of opposing principles and points of view, that desire to rise in words to lofty areas and obscure the conflicts of historical groups of the population with phrases (*that is, the conflict between Capital and Labour. - S.K.*)".

Again Lenin, arguing with the Narodniks, wrote like this:

"You say that the intelligentsia should direct Russia to "other paths" - you don't you understand that, not adjoining a class, it is zero.

Brilliant in its brevity and accuracy thought! The best representatives of the Russian intelligentsia, that is, the Russian intellectuals proper, ceased to be zero and became at the head of the creation of a new Russia only after they had joined the creative class, the working people.

And the "sixties" Soviet "intelligentsia" and its successors were increasingly moving away from the people and therefore became more and more social zero. But during the collapse of the USSR, this unstable, controversial social stratum, in order not to finally turn into zero, joined the "class" of the "new Russians", that is, in fact, to the gang.

That is what he lives on now.

And here's what you need to understand...

The same Lenin came from the nobility, had a higher legal education, not a single day in his life stood at the bench, did not go for a plow on arable land, and also did not own plants and factories. In other words, Lenin did not belong to either the exploiting classes or the exploited classes, but was part of precisely that social stratum called the intelligentsia. Nevertheless, he seemed to distance himself from the intelligentsia.

And it's understandable why.

At the beginning of the book, I already cited the opinion of the Russian historian Vasily Osipovich Klyuchevsky - who, by the way, also excluded himself from the "intelligentsia". Klyuchevsky spoke in the sense that in Russian society the word "intelligentsia" arose as a kind of misunderstanding.

In my opinion, Klyuchevsky's idea is a very accurate idea. The word "intellectual" is ambiguous, twofold. Therefore, in different cases, in relation to different situations, they denote not just different, but even antagonistic concepts. So, in Russia there have always been the expressions "lousy intellectual", "rotten intelligentsia." But is it possible to say, for example, "a lousy intelligent person" or "rotten intelligence"? Of course not.

The concept of "intelligence" is identical to the naturalness of behavior performed self-respect and respect for others, non-pretentiousness of thoughts, etc.

But the concept of "intelligentsia" ...

No, it's more difficult here.

Already from the beginning of the Petrine reforms, to replace the former "elite" of the Third Rome, who knew how to count on the fingers all the heresies of Roman, Luthor or Armenian and knew by heart the lofty legend about the moral decline of the world and the transformation of Moscow into the Third Rome, people of action began to come to Russia, "nestlings of Petrov's nest. They stubbornly mastered and developed the knowledge of artillery, fortification, mining, medical, etc. And they mastered this knowledge not just for themselves, but in order to save the Third Rome from the "fallen" world.

However, along with people of action, with intellectuals, in Russia there was always enough of the "elite" of the pre-Petrine model - idle or little efficient. It was from her that the "Russian" "intelligentsia" originated. And this old Russian sore has successfully survived to this day.

Eh, how can we get rid of it, at least in the 21st century?

Here is another opinion regarding a significant part of the social stratum that we call "intelligentsia". I must say right away that it belongs to our great satirist Saltykov-Shchedrin and was expressed in his article "Literary Watchmen", published in the Dobrolyubov "Whistle" in 1863. Sadly, but having in mind some processes contemporary to him, Shchedrin described point to point the way of life of the current "Russian" "elite" "intelligentsia". And he described it so accurately that if I had not immediately pointed to the source of the quote, the reader would most likely consider it taken from a modern article and to the question: "Who is this about?" - would immediately answer: "Well, about these, about the "democrats" from the TV screen."

Moreover, Saltykov, after all, Shchedrin, like Lenin, like Klyuchevsky, was also a fully educated, developed and *intelligent* person, but nevertheless he pushed himself away from *the intelligentsia* and almost 150 years ago wrote this:

"Coming little by little into some kind of coldly frenzied enthusiasm, the watchman ... sticks out his tongue not only to the present, but sticks it out to the past, sticks out to the future ...

All these watchmen writers (in *Russia at the time, policemen were sitting in special booths, hence their name.* - S.K.), defending some principles ... they will either indulge in mockery, then they will burst into barking against imaginary enemies, then they will begin to sentimentalize with imaginary allies... But no matter how they rise to rise to abusive lyricism... still one note oozes - a note of vulgar... mockery.

There are people who cannot relate even to great events and great principles except from the point of view of their small, pocket interests. These are midges that hover in swarms around a living organism ... They buzz with all their might that they strike the enemies of a living organism, but ... they only strike the organism itself. These are the heralds of hatred, these are the sowers of internecine strife, these are the people whom one must beware of, because with their help no business can ever be finished, because they always have some kind of long-standing enmity, some ... unexplained account ... "

Very accurate! All the current "democratized" "intellectuals", these heralds of hatred and sowers of civil strife, have a "pocket" attitude towards great events and the great principles of our Soviet history, and long-standing enmity towards the USSR ...

They also have a certain unexplained account with the USSR: the USSR to them - in their opinion - *underpaid*.

What did the hockey player Vyacheslav Fetisov (b. 1957) have in the USSR? Let's take an example from a slightly different sphere. Well, he graduated from the Leningrad Military Institute of Physical Education for free, well, he became a thirteen-time champion of the USSR, a multiple world and European champion, a two-time Olympic champion as part of CSKA ... Well, he was loved by a huge country.

But after all, he was loved unselfishly.

But when Vyacheslav Fetisov left for the United States in 1989 and began playing in the NHL, he almost immediately opened a gourmet shop and bought a farm in Canada to grow ginseng.

This is life.

Fetisov was sent into retirement in the NHL, he was immediately warmed up by Vladimir Putin, made chairman of the State Committee of the Russian Federation for Physical Education and Sports. True, as for physical education in the Russian Federation, it is rather weak, and sports are not very good, but what to grieve about - Vyacheslav Fetisov has a store for the rich in the USA, and a farm in Canada. Somehow Fetisov will live without the victories of "Russian" sports, and even more so without mass physical education and all sorts of "Golden Pucks" and "Leather Balls" for homeless Russian boys.

And when Fetisov is asked how he lived in the USSR and how he lived in the USA, he answers like this: "In the USSR, when I left the store on the Volga, I knew that it had become twice as expensive. And when I left the store in America in a Mercedes, they immediately told me that it had become half the price.

He's lying, of course, about "twice as expensive", and about "twice as cheap", probably lying, but shame is not smoke, it will not eat out the eyes.

Moreover, the Fetisovs have no shame.

In the USSR, hockey - even at the highest level - was still a sport. In the US and Canada, it has long been a business fueled by advertising. Therefore, the Soviet Union could only give its sports stars the Volga and the love of the people. And America to its advertising agents on skates - yes, it can and does give "Mercedes" and... a caricature of people's love – *frenzy of fans*.

So... Approximately the same can be said about the rest of the representatives of the "free" professions in the Khrushchev-Brezhnev USSR. Well, how could one compare the fees of some Jean-Paul Belmondo in France with the fees of the incomparable Basilashvili in the USSR? Or - the Soviet income of Alla Pugacheva with the income of Mireille Mathieu and Dalida? Or the income of Julian Lyandres (Semyonov) with the income of Sidney Sheldon...

And if we compare the masters of the movie screen *here* and *there*, then there will be complete underpayments in general. No villas, no private pools, no diamond sets, no expensive salons for dearly beloved dogs and cats.

This is what they were dissatisfied with, this is what the USSR offended them with - they did not add a *super-fat* piece to a piece of bread with butter and black caviar. And the "intellectuals" - as soon as they began to pay for it - began to bite the hand that fed them. Bite for generous handouts from the new "masters of life".

Well, they, these bearers of "solid ethical guidelines", finally received their diamond sets - for all thirty pieces of silver. But unlike the biblical Judas, they will never and never hang themselves out of shame and repentance. After all, in order to repent, one must have some sort of soul. And instead of a soul they have "soft lyricism".

Yes, "thinkers" flourish in the West, but only those who in one way or another serve owners-"treasurers" or at least ideologically does not oppose them.

In the USSR, thinkers - without quotes - if they did not flourish, then, in any case, they had no need *to sell themselves*.

Now, when the "ball" in the Russians is also ruled by "treasurers", homegrown "thinkers", those who serve their interests receive very fatty leftovers from the master's table.

Well, bon appetit *gentlemen*...

And while "eating", the "Russian intellectuals", being "creative" natures, little by little get into such frenzied enthusiasm that they stick out their tongues to the Soviet past not even for "carpets", but out of "love for art". They either burst into barking against the USSR, or become sentimental at the memory of the former "sovereigns-emperors" and other "lyrically-exalted".

They do not risk showing their tongues to the future in the hope that in the future they will be fed by the same "masters of life". However, the future itself - if it is still "Russian" - will still show them the language, and how else will it show!

And not only the language, but also the fist in which the club of the "peacekeeper" of the UN or NATO will be clamped.

What if our future is Soviet again? What then?

Well, the Soviet future - if we have it - will "honor" the "Russian intelligentsia", perhaps, *with a rod*. After all, the "intellectuals" barking at their Motherland deserve nothing else.

Saltykov-Shchedrin is right, these are people who must beware, because they are incapable of fighting "for", they are always fighting "against".

However, not always...

Today's "intellectuals" enthusiastically and selflessly fight *against* our real Soviet past, they, trembling with fear, fight *against* our possible Soviet future, but with the same frenzied enthusiasm they fight *for* the current foul present.

After all, this is the present - the flesh of their flesh.

One Russian intellectual, living in times of instability and anxiety, once wrote:

"I won't be at all surprised if, although not very soon, the people, smart, calm, understanding what the intelligentsia cannot understand (namely, with socialist psychology, completely, diametrically different), begin ..." calmly and majestically hang and rob intellectuals (to restore order, to clear the brain of the country from garbage) ...

The indignant buzzing "intelligent" swarm ask you to wait a bit with indignation and buzzing, I have not finished quoting yet:

"If the brain of the country continues to feed on the same ironies, slavish fears, slavish experience of tired nations, then it will cease to be a brain, and it will be thrown out - soon, cruelly and majestically ... What right do we have to be afraid of our great, intelligent and kind people? .. "

This was written by... Alexander Blok in letters to his mother dated June 19 and 21, 1917, a little over seventy-four years before Yeltsin's August putsch of 1991 and less than seventy-six years before his October 1993 putsch.

Deep thinkers (without quotes) are able to look far, and it is possible that Blok's words will turn out to be prophetic not only for our distant past, but also for our near future.

Only let's do without the gallows this time - *a rod will suffice*.

Chapter 12

Mikhail Marked, Boris Bespaly, then - anyone ...

I have in front of me a printout from the Internet dated February 17, 2009 with a list of persons included in the first hundred of the reserve of managerial personnel under the patronage of the President of the Russian Federation.

Konstantin Akimov, Maxim Akimov, Igor Barinov, Said Batkibekov, Oleg Belozеров, Oleg Budargin, Andrei Burenin, Sergei Velmyaikin, Vyacheslav Gaiser, Tatyana Gorbachik, Sergei Guriev, Garry Minkh, Vladimir Nazarov, Liana Pepelyaeva, Alexander Pertsovsky, Pavel Chinilin, etc. etc. - only one hundred representatives of federal and regional bodies of "authority", "business", "science", "education" and "public organizations" (all areas of activity have to be taken, alas, in quotation marks).

One hundred names of potential candidates for the highest government positions. Who are they? These and other names from the list say nothing not only to me, but also to the country. However, it can be assumed that none of these names has a serious experience of real management - not the administration of "power", but the management school of making such decisions that would strengthen the power of the country *and* its economy, *develop* them *and bring good and benefit to the people*, and not individual "the best representatives of the people."

There is no doubt that it would be possible without difficulty to compose another a similar list, with another hundred names.

And the third list could be compiled, and the fourth, and the tenth... And the "managerial" "potential" of any such hundred would be approximately the same -

zero, if we evaluate it from the standpoint of ensuring the prosperity of the peoples of Russia.

More precisely, it is necessary to talk about a deeply negative "potential", because *you will recognize them by their deeds*, and their deeds are here, in front of everyone. And these things are very unfortunate, if we mean not the sharp increase in the number of billionaires in Russia, but the sharp and comprehensive growth of its complex civilizational potential, as it was in the old days.

But the rest is about something else...

I look at the list from the Internet and think - and after all, there was, presumably, somewhere a list of persons included in the reserve of future managerial personnel in the "Rossiyanin" and "CIS", who were supposed to form the "power" after the collapse of the USSR? Was there somewhere a list of "foremen of treason" under the patronage of the world *reserve* of the private property elite? ..

In confirmation of the fact that such a list could not be missing, today we can refer to the numerous literature on the collapse of the USSR, which I mentioned at the beginning of the book and which the reader, if desired, can somehow find and read. However, I will cite only one confession - Mikhail Poltoranin, a former loyal Yeltsin, now reflecting on Yeltsin's "inhuman, cannibalistic" system in his sensational book *Power in TNT*. Poltoranin writes:

"Yeltsin brought the idea of the presidency in Russia from a trip to the United States, when in 1989 he met with the functionaries of B'nai B'rith there. They did not know who could personally become the leader of the republic that would hold together (*more precisely, of course, destroy*. - S.K.) the Soviet Union - it was not so important. The principle itself was important, when the popularly elected President of Russia appeared next to the semi-legitimate President of the USSR, appointed by a group of deputies (*that is, Gorbachev*. - S.K.). A collision arose: who was "first" ... A conflict was laid between the institutions of power. Its scope should depend on the ambitions of politicians. And if B'nai B'rith keeps these politicians under control, you can resolve the situation as you like"...

I don't know if Poltoranin himself understands *that*, firstly, he wrote, and secondly, what a mixture of right and wrong is this "revelation" of his.

Well, one could believe that Yeltsin brought the idea of the presidency in Russia from a trip to the United States. But this is already doubtful. Yeltsin personally did not and could not have any ideas, even if it seemed to him or Poltoranin that some ideas came to their minds on their own. The scenario for the final actions to destroy the USSR was not conceived by them, it was conceived a long time ago, it has been improved and refined more than once. The "conflict" between the institutions of power, as the visible reason for the collapse of the USSR, was embedded in the very fabric of the script, and the development of this "conflict" depended not on the ambitions of Gorbachev and Yeltsin, but on their puppeteers inside the USSR and on directors and screenwriters outside the USSR.

And scriptwriters outside the USSR were, it must be understood, by no means in the leadership of B'nai B'rith (a weak level), although they could appear to Yeltsin as functionaries of B'nai B'rith. So the "idea of the presidency in Russia" was not exported to Russia in 1989 and not by Yeltsin. Although, yes, of course, this "idea" could have been thrown to Yeltsin personally through B'nai B'rith. Or they could have thrown it through one of Yeltsin's "grey eminences" - after all, there were enough of those around Yeltsin.

One way or another, it did not depend on the will of Yeltsin - whether or not to be the RSFSR "presidential republic" on the eve of the collapse of the USSR.

And here is one more "blunder" of Poltoranin... To write that for the West it was *not so important* who can *personally* become the leader of Russia, then write nonsense!

Then, in 1989, it was extremely important. "It was Yeltsin who cheated with all his might, and overnight it was impossible to replace him with, say, Chubais. Therefore, Poltoranin's statement that the functionaries of the world "elite" allegedly "did not know" who would be the "leader of Russia" is also nonsense!

Naturally, the West could and did keep the whole gang of politicians, the ultimate destroyers and murderers of the USSR, under control. And although everyone in this gang had their own role and task, the figures of the second row had understudies and backed each other up.

But with regard to the two main puppets, the West, especially in 1991, had no choice simply because by the beginning of the "catastrophe" in the USSR, these two puppets were carefully selected by the West personally, and selected precisely for the first *roles*.

And it was precisely Gorbachev and Yeltsin, even if they themselves are talking about it - for the time being - did not know.

However, Gorbachev most likely *knew*, because the connection "Andropov - Gorbachev" could not be accidental. But Yeltsin, very likely, was used – taking into account the peculiarities of his nature – "in the dark" (as Khrushchev was used "in the dark" decades before). And it is possible that this was the case until the very end. The directors were experienced, and they could turn "Tsar Boris" as they needed, without even letting him in on their true plans. It was enough to correctly orient and instruct the puppeteers inside the USSR, and then - "Russian".

That is why, by 1991, both Gorbachev and Yeltsin could no longer have doubles for the role of the highest murderers of the USSR within the USSR. If we look at the composition of the top leadership of the USSR in the "pre-Gorbachev" period, we will not find a single figure there who would subsequently, after 1991, be directly treacherous. One can point to several suspicious candidates like Gromyko, but they were all too old for the first role.

If we look at the composition of the Central Committee of the CPSU, elected at the XXVII Congress of the CPSU in 1986, then out of 303 of its members, only members of the Politburo Gorbachev, Yeltsin, Yakovlev, a number of "national" secretaries (Aliev, Kravchuk, Nazarbayev and etc.), Academician Arbatov, Minister of Internal Affairs Bakatin, Chairman of the KGB Kryuchkov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR Silaev, Minister of the Gas Industry Chernomyrdin, to a certain extent - General Bobkov from the KGB, Head. Department of the Central Committee Volsky, Minister of Health of the USSR Chazov. One can name a few more names from the "Gorbachev" Central Committee, but all of them - mentioned or not mentioned - by 1991 could not replace Gorbachev as the supreme destroyer of the USSR.

It was exactly the same at the level of the leadership of the RSFSR - Yeltsin, as the destroyer of the USSR, had no alternative there.

Mikhail Poltoranin writes about the days of the State Emergency Committee:

"The August events of 1991 were overgrown with such bunches of myths that sometimes you start to stray in the origins (*Ha!* - S.K.): how everything really happened. To stray and be surprised by unknown events. Although I was at their epicenter from the first to the last hours of the confrontation with the State Emergency Committee. In the organization of the putsch (*Poltoranin, of course, does not mean the Yeltsin putsch, he calls the formation of the GKChP putsch.* - S.K.), in the behavior of the main actors on both sides, it already seemed to me a lot of strange, suspicious ... "

And just below:

"It seems that the creation of the State Emergency Committee was planned as an apex action, as an attempt to instill fear in society. I do not rule out that *the Kremlin director (emphasis mine in italics - S.K.)* also had an ulterior motive : in case of a favorable development of events for him, to hold back Yeltsin's step would have been shaken too widely ... "

Yes, although Poltoranin was in *the "epicenter of events"*, he either did not understand anything, or pretended not to understand. What does *the Kremlin director* have to do with it?! Poltoranin means, of course, Gorbachev. But Gorbachev in the events of August 1991 (as well as before them, and after them) was not a director, but the same puppet as Yeltsin, with the only one, obviously,

the difference is that Gorbachev knew that he was a *doll*, and Yeltsin considered himself the creator of history.

Incidentally, about the "epicenter" of events. In fact, it is more correct to say in *the "center of events"*, because the epicenter is a point on the surface of the Earth, located directly above the focus (hypocenter) of an earthquake or *under* the point of an air nuclear explosion. However, Poltoranin, using the word "epicenter" and making a standard formal error, in this case unwittingly got to the point.

The true reason for what happens at the epicenter is not in it, but *in a completely different* place. So the reason for the events of August 1991 in Moscow was far from Moscow - in one of the foreign centers of the world "elite". It was from there that the "underground" tremors came, it was there that the "earthquake" that destroyed the USSR was born, or, if another image is desired, the "nuclear explosion" that destroyed the second superpower of the world was born.

Even today this could be understood - twenty years after those events and after a series of direct confessions (more precisely, semi-confessions, of course) of some (secondary, of course) screenwriters and directors.

So it was not the quarrels between Gorbachev and Yeltsin and their ambitions - just external directors with the help of internal puppeteers confidently played out a farce skillfully staged by them, which turned into a tragedy for the peoples of the USSR.

At the same time, the directors remained abroad, and the direct puppeteers were in Moscow and pulled the strings of both the two main puppets and those puppets that made up the environment of the two main puppets.

Who was the main puppeteer in Moscow, we are unlikely to find out, but this is not so important. The important thing is that there could not be puppeteers, and they were. After all, the USSR collapsed in 1991-1992 not from organic diseases, but was finished off after a slow poisoning over many years. This has already been said and more will be said.

To plan, organize, and then implement a plan to undermine and destroy a huge, powerful and comprehensively developed power was more than not easy. It was necessary to identify its weak points, to find pain points, it was necessary to learn how to adjust your plans. All this took decades. But also the frames of the future destroyers had to be selected!

Today it is being asserted – by Dmitry Oreshkin, a member of the Council for the Development of Civil Society and Human Rights under the President of the Russian Federation, for example – that the famous quote from the “Allen Dulles plan” about preparing the destruction of the USSR and personnel for this destruction – just a fake, allegedly put into circulation by “Soviet agitprop”.

But, firstly, this quote became public attention in the 90s of the “Yeltsin” years, that is, when the “agitprop” in Moscow was already completely anti-Soviet.

Secondly, even if this quote is not authentic, so what? After all, the essence is reflected correctly.

Thirdly, the ardent “de-Stalinizer”, a member of the Presidential Council Dmitry Oreshkin - is it not the same, who categorically does not accept the era of Stalin, Dmitry Borisovich Oreshkin, a senior researcher at the Institute of Geography of the USSR Academy of Sciences, who, a year before the destruction of the USSR, in 1990, in an interview about the fate of the Aral Sea (no doubt, this is one of the crimes of Brezhnevism) did he say some curious things?

For example, these:

“... What is balance? What kind of balance are we talking about? About the balance in which the man of the Stone Age was with the environment of the Ice Age? If the Cro-Magnon knew how to vote, he would give his vote for the conservation of glaciation, because it meant the existence of abundant herds, good hunting and meat food! .. ”

The hint was transparent for 1990... They say, citizens of the USSR, don't be antediluvian Cro-Magnons and don't hold on to your icy USSR, even if it is able to give you plentiful herds and meat food... “We will live in a new way, we will live

in a new way, "as the Lyube group sang then.

That Dmitry Oreshkin "sang" - in his own way - in 1990 something similar and said
So:

"We urgently need alternatives! The main thing is to return the owner to the land ... Then we will have products, saved water, there will be people with a conscious economic interest who are not indifferent to what is being done on their land. *Then there will be a lot.* Including *inequality, and exacerbation of social difficulties* (emphasis mine. - S.K.). The situation today is truly revolutionary..."

This is how *some people* looked in 1990 "sagaciously" into the historical distance, seeing in the future of Russia and social inequality, and the aggravation of social difficulties ...

Appeared after 1991 in the life of Russia and people "with a conscious economic interest." And what is the result? And it is such that all environmental crimes (I do not argue, crimes) that were committed by Khrushchevism and Brezhnevism look almost like childish pranks compared to what these "revolutionaries" with a "conscious economic interest" are doing in Russia.

One scorched Russia of 2010 is worth something!

What about deforestation?

And what about the rapaciously used bowels and waters?

Will there be more...

And so I read *this*, I read *this*, and I think - who are you, Dmitry Oreshkin?

A?

And here are the "seers" of the 1991 model... Then in Moscow, under the wing of the Novosti Press Agency, a small and modest, but curious magazine "The 20th Century and the World" was published with a circulation of 100,000 copies. And in No. 4 for 1991, a certain Denis Dragunsky - four months before the Yeltsin coup - "providentially" declared: "Being a world testing ground is the meaning of Russia ..."

At the same time, Dragunsky assured fellow citizens:

"This role was by no means imposed on us by insidious Western forces. Of course, it is more convenient to think that you are not an accomplice, but a victim of a great experiment, and in general everything that happens is the fruit of a world conspiracy (for example, Zionomasonic)."

After all, there is something to analyze here, starting with the fact that experiment is different from experiment!

The work of building the world's first workers' state without the power of money and shares was openly called by the new Russia a social experiment! And how could it be otherwise, if it was really a bold social experiment undertaken by the most active forces of the peoples of the USSR in the interests of the peoples of the USSR.

On the other hand, there really is no need to talk about a "conspiracy" - let's leave this nonsense to neo-Slavophiles, "Eurasians" and other *boobies* from "conspiracy theories". The notorious "conspiracy theory" is stupid (or provocative - whatever you like) just because it does not consider the world social process through the prism of class analysis. And if you look at the world through this prism, it becomes clear that we should not talk about a "conspiracy", but about a completely logical and long-planned *plan* of the world "elite" to counteract the idea of a global unification of workers in the interests of workers, and only workers.

And in this sense, since the end of the 50s, Soviet Russia really turned out to be the world "elite" as a testing ground where the technology of dismantling socialism was worked out.

In the light of subsequent events, the following passage of the "seer" Dragunsky looks extremely revealing:

"Now (*this was written in April 1991!* - S.K.) the last experiment is going on at the test site. This super-experiment should answer the question: how long can you live, prolonging the state of the experiment?"

The "prophet" (or maybe just a well-informed person?) Dragunsky asked this question a few months before the collapse of the USSR, and 20 years have passed since then. The experiment of the world "elite" over Russia is still going on, and therefore today we have the right to ask the same question as Denis Dragunsky twenty years ago: "How long can one live, prolonging the state of this ahistorical, inhumane and anti-Russian experiment?"

In the same April issue of the entertaining magazine "The XX Century and the World" for 1991, a certain Vladimir Kagansky in an imaginary dialogue between the Radical and the Guardian on behalf of the Radical stated:

"You have some kind of passion to scare with the coming "catastrophes". And our system is an eternal catastrophe, and the whole society lives in the Gulag (*so, the bastard, he wrote in 1991!* - S.K.), the cells of which are administrative units.

Four months later, the first of the universal catastrophes broke out in Russia, opening a whole string of them, lasting to this day and still uninterrupted.

So did the forces hostile to the USSR prepare this catastrophe or not?

Alas, they prepared it, stocking up in advance with numerous "home-made preparations".

Mikhail Tagged was planned a long time ago - otherwise Andropov would not have lobbied him so persistently.

Boris Bespaly was found later and they began to lift him up in a steep spiral. At the very first Plenum of the Central Committee after Gorbachev was brought to power, the first secretary of the Sverdlovsk regional committee of the CPSU, Boris Yeltsin, expressed himself in the sense that a viscous layer of officials and selfish people had formed between the Central Committee and the people. This was the truth, which was unusual to hear from the highest rostrum, and everyone immediately *started up*.

Yeltsin's name - the name of a mediocre partocrat that did not tell anyone *before* his speech - *immediately* became popular *after* his speech .

From that phrase it went, and "flooded". And it was a good move on the part of the writers and directors of the future collapse.

Five years later, Mikhail Marked became the gravedigger of the party, and Boris Bespaly, together with Mikhail Marked - the gravedigger of the USSR.

And only after the *main thing* was done, it was possible to put anyone at the head of the "Russian" - one colorless than the other. In the same candid - by 1991 - magazine "Century of the XX and the World", the future leading ideologist-political scientist "Rossiyanin" Gleb Pavlovsky, honing his "striking" pen, wrote (in April 1991):

"For some time now, we have been observing how the figure of yesterday's six in charge as the future boss...

Behind the idea of a strong effective government, a powerful reformist structure - sneaks son of a bitch with nothing but the lust of dominion itself...

This guy can't do anything and never has. At best, an intelligent intermediary, a hardware gesheftmakher who knows a hundred necessary phones ... "

The generalized portrait of the upcoming elite Yeltsinoid is given quite accurately. And here is a personal illustration for this portrait - Yeltsin's "near" confidante Valentin Yumashev. Yeltsin himself, in his book The Presidential Marathon, wrote that Yumashev once frankly confessed to him:

"You know, Boris Nikolaevich, after all, this is somehow not my life. I feel like the character in Mark Twain's *The Prince and the Pauper* who was given the seal of the state. Of course, I won't crack nuts with it, but there is such a desire ... "

"Statesmen" like Yumashev, recruited by the directors of the Yeltsin "epoch" to the highest echelons of state power, did not crack nuts with it, this power. They began to destroy Russia with it and are doing this to this day.

As additional "information for reflection", I will inform the reader that among the Yeltsinoid "power" "elite" of the highest level (not lower than the federal ministers) brought to power in the Russian Federation, not so many come from the Soviet "elite". It is not difficult to list them by name.

So, one of the Deputy Prime Minister Kasyanov (there was such a Yeltsinoid) Boris Alyoshin - the son of the Deputy Minister of Trade of the USSR, and the banker Gerashchenko is the son of the first deputy of the State Bank of the USSR and then of a high rank in the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The grandfather of Sergei Kiriyenko, the prime minister of the "default", personally knew Lenin and named his son Vladilen after him. Father Kirienko - Vladilen Yakovlevich Izraitel, Professor of the Department of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy of the Gorky Institute of Water Transport - he did not pass on his last name to his son, but Sergei Kiriyenko retained his ultra-communist patronymic, which did not prevent him from making an anti-communist career.

The father of the large Yeltsinoid Nikolai Bordyuzha stood at the origins of the creation of the Soviet Strategic Missile Forces, and the father of Andrei Nikolaev, director of the Federal Border Service of the Russian Federation under Chernomyrdin, was the first deputy chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces (and was friends with Yeltsin, with whom he lived on the same landing) .

The father of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation Igor Ivanov is a Moscow KGB colonel (mother, Eliko Sagarashvili, was a police major, head of the traffic police of the Soviet district of Moscow); the father of the Chief Military Prosecutor of the Russian Federation Demin is a major general of the KGB, and the father of the odious Minister of Education and Science of the Russian Federation Andrei Fursenko is an academician, specialist in US history, academician-secretary of the Department of History of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

Yeltsin's adviser Mikhail Lesin was born in the family of the builder of the Brezhnev complex in Zavidovo "Rus" and the dacha of the Minister of Defense of the USSR Grechko, and another young "comrade-in-arms" of Yeltsin, Ruslan Orekhov, was born in the family of the attending physician, member of the Politburo, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Kunaev and member of the Politburo of the first Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Nazarbayev.

Chernomyrdin's first deputy chairman, Vladimir Potanin, is the son of the Soviet head of the Vostokintorg foreign economic association, and Galina Starovoitova is the daughter of an elite defense professor and second cousin of twice Hero of Socialist Labor Starovoitov, chairman of the Rassvet collective farm in Belarus.

The father of the valiant "emergency" Sergei Shoigu was the Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Tuva ASSR. But the mother of the future Yeltsin vice-president Rutskoy was only selling beer in Kursk. The son rose higher - he began to trade with the Motherland.

Among the Yeltsin "elite" there were also two truly gentry "comrades-in-arms". Yeltsin's press secretary, Sergei Yastrzhembsky, came from a family of noble gentry, and his successor press secretary, Dmitry Yakushkin, was in general a descendant of the famous Decembrist Yakushkin.

Yakushkin's father, a KGB major general, was a resident of foreign intelligence not just anywhere, but in Washington, and his son studied at an American school. Then my father became the head of the US department at the vocational school of the KGB of the USSR and, in this capacity, hired the famous traitor Oleg Gordievsky, who later fled to the British, to work in the KGB. However, the son of a prominent KGB rank did not really hide his dislike for the Soviet system, although he worked in the leading Soviet media. One can imagine how he "strengthened" the ideological power of the USSR.

The unsurpassed Dmitry Anatolyevich Medvedev - the same one from the Kremlin - also has rather elitist roots, he is from a Leningrad professorial family. Not God knows what, of course, but compared with the almost "worker-peasant" origin of Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin, this is something.

However, Putin also had something in the pedigree. His grandfather, who died in 1965, initially worked as a cook in Gorki when Lenin and his family lived there. Then my grandfather was transferred to one of Stalin's dachas, and in recent years he lived and cooked in the rest house of the Moscow CC CPSU in Ilyinsky. So if not the corridors, then *the kitchen* of the power of his grandson learned from childhood.

There are not so many among the approximately four hundred top Yeltsinoid functionaries, including the Putin-Yeltsin ones, and people from families that were offended in one way or another by the Soviet power.

Of the repressed come Peter Aven, the grandson of the Latvian shooter who was shot in 1937; deputy Prime Minister Chernomyrdin Maxim Boyko, the grandson of Solomon Dridzo (Lozovsky), a prominent Soviet functionary who was shot in 1952; Yegor Gaidar, German Gref and Alfred Koch. The parents of the last two were evicted to Kazakhstan in 1941 as Germans. In 1937, the grandfather of Viktor Khristenko was shot, as was the maternal grandfather of Irina Khakamada, a member of the CPSU since 1984.

Just like the grandfather and parents of Boris Yeltsin, the parents of Ivan Silaev, the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR at the time of the collapse of the USSR, were dispossessed. And the grandfather of the chairman of the KGB of the RSFSR in the government of Silaev, Viktor Ivanenko, was repressed as a member of the Baptist sect.

You can name two or three more names, and that's it. The vast majority of the Yeltsin-Putin "nomenklatura" is of quite ordinary origin, down to the most ordinary - from workers and peasants, such as, for example, the chairman of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation, Valery Zorkin, who was born in 1943 in the village of Konstantinovka, Primorsky Krai.

Biographies are also ordinary, typically Soviet.

Amazing, but true!

One thing in the Yeltsinoid elite of the first and second draft is somewhat non-standard - an abundance of people from St. Petersburg. Such a detail is often associated with Putin's influence, but this is unlikely. Rather, we should talk about the "Sobchak school", in the rating of "foremen of treason" far from last.

The influence of other, already nameless Leningrad "schools" is also possible. The shadowy structures of the West like to joke, and the idea of training Yeltsin's counter-revolutionary cadres mainly in the "cradle of the revolution" could well seem to the world "elite" amusing and deserving of implementation.

However, even among the "Leningraders" elitist children do not prevail.

I will give brief information about two major (not in terms of personality, but in terms of their positions) post-perestroika figures who figure at the heights of power under President Medvedev. Just - from the "Leningraders".

Chairman of the State Duma Boris Gryzlov, Ministry of Internal Affairs in the government of Kasyanov from 2001 to 2003, was born in 1950 in Voronezh in the family of a military pilot, since 1954 he lived in Leningrad, graduated from a physics and mathematics school with a gold medal and then - The Leningrad Electrotechnical Institute of Communications named after M.A. Bonch-Bruевич worked in the field of space communications and the development of integrated circuits ... It seems that he was supposed to grow up and grow up as a Soviet patriot, but no - he grew into one of the major destroyers of the Fatherland.

The "unsinkable" "voucher" Anatoly Chubais, born in 1955, was born in the city of Borisov, Minsk region of the BSSR, in the family of a colonel-political worker, who ended his service as head of the department of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in one of the military universities of Leningrad. Mother, Raisa Khaimovna Sagal, an economist by education, a housewife. She also seemed to be able to raise her son as a worthy person - both education and time

Raisa Khaimovna seemed to be enough for this. No, she brought up a moral monster and a destroyer.

In 1972, Chubais entered the Leningrad Engineering and Economic Institute named after Palmiro Togliatti, writing an essay on the topic "As I understand the lines of the poet Yevtushenko "Always shine! There will be no light in the souls, no hydroelectric power stations will help us, "and after graduating from the institute, he remained at the LIEI as a teacher and joined the CPSU.

I can't help but notice that, judging by the post-perestroika activities of Chubais, the lines of the "poet Yevtushenko" sunk deep into Anatoly's soul, and therefore he, in charge of the Unified Energy Network of Russia, did not really pay attention to the technical condition of power plants, including the Sayano-Shushenskaya HPP. On the other hand, he correctly grasped the idea of one of the future "elite" traitors to the USSR: it is necessary to shine into the souls *at the right angle*, and then all sorts of Dneproges and other hydroelectric power plants there are the tenth thing. After all, if "dear Russians" do not have the light of "democracy" in their souls, no hydroelectric power stations will help them.

Here Chubais shines for us.

And while it shines for us, alas, nothing shines for us.

If we evaluate the general dynamics of changes in the level of supreme power in the Russian Federation over the years, then one thing can be said: even compared to the gray Yeltsin "elite", the current, Putin-Medvedev's, turns out to be even more gray and incompetent, despite the universal higher education and abundance certain "scientific" degrees.

However, now even a hint of personality and originality for a high leader in the "two-headed tandem" "Rossiyanin" is impossible. These are no longer required.

The secret list of agents of influence who were to carry out the main actions to destroy the USSR within the USSR was, as I understand it, like a cartridge clip. Each "cartridge" was selected, wiped and entered into the common "clip" accurately and firmly.

It was impossible to simply take, for example, someone from this list - let's call him *conditionally* Burbulis or Chubais - and replace him with some hastily selected, just turned up at hand, say, Tara-Barkin.

The agent of influence, *tentatively* called Burbulis or Chubais, could, of course, be replaced if necessary, but also with a long-selected and trained agent of influence from a secret list, for example, an agent *tentatively* called Sobchak.

And even then it was hardly so simple - after all, this *conditional* Sobchak had to be introduced to Yeltsin's inner circle, and this is not done in one day.

That's why I spread "polites" here with *conventions*, because "democracy" is now cool in our country, just about anything - "offended" run to court, and I didn't stand with a candle when signing certain subscriptions, I wasn't present at secret briefings.

So it's better to call conventional names that only *coincidentally* coincide with real ones.

Yes, there is no doubt: the persons from *that* pre-perestroika list were selected and carefully prepared. They had to solve a great and almost impossible task - to ensure the destruction of the USSR from within the USSR.

But what if we return to the list of "persons included in the first hundred of the reserve of managerial personnel under the patronage of the President of the Russian Federation" dated 2009, from which this chapter began?

This is where you can nominate anyone to the "epicenter" of events - anyone will do. Persons from the current list of "candidates for power" are easily replaced by others - today, any not only spiritual, but also intellectual scum can be recruited into such lists. If only they knew how to obey, they had no conscience and they loved "loot in havlo".

Mikhail Tagged, as I understand it, did not have understudies.

Nor did Boris Bespaly.

True, at one time there were rumors that Yeltsin had doubles, and this can be believed. From some point, Yeltsin was ill and could die overnight - man is mortal. And the scriptwriters and directors could not allow this, therefore, for them

it would only be reasonable to prepare one or two Yeltsin doubles, so that in the event of the unexpected death of the "popularly elected" there would be some reserve of time for maneuver. But a double is not a double.

Now one understudy can be exchanged for another, and vice versa – the demand for unique figures has fallen. Putin and Medvedev are not bright (where does the brightness come from?), but quite a convincing example. And with the current electronic "voting" system, even Chubais can be quickly and successfully "inflated" to the size of another "popularly elected" president.

The thing, consider, is done and is rolling along the long-knurled rut to the finish line - the collapse is already "Russian". And if the peoples of Russia do not understand this in time, they *will be brought to him*.

Therefore, we need to understand the situation as soon as possible, while understanding why the USSR fell?

Chapter 13

So why did the USSR fall?

In this book, as in my other books, I assert over and over again that the USSR collapsed in 1991-1992 not from organic diseases, but was finished off after a slow poisoning in
for many years.

At the same time, I am aware that the reader can reasonably remark: "What is the supposedly most advanced social system worth, which could not save itself? A healthy body is good!"

That's right, but let's ask ourselves - Julius Caesar, for example, was a fool?

It seems to be - no. And he fell like the last fool, stabbed to death in broad daylight in the center of Rome.

No, no mind and no health can save you from treason.

Of course, it can also be said to this that it is good to be a system, which allows renegades and traitors to rise to the heights of power. And this remark also has its own reason.

Well, Soviet Russia really turned out to be imprudent in some ways, ingenuous and beautiful-hearted in some ways, and inexperienced in some ways. After all, the matter was unprecedented, not without reason Mayakovsky wrote: "Enough to live by the law given by Adam and Eve ..." And this was so - before the experience of building a state appeared on the world map of the Soviet Union, where there is no power of money and there are no private owners-exploiters, nor one people did not have.

We were the first and failed to take into account a number of important factors. And they took into account and beat us.

So what?

This means that we need to analyze the defeat and on a new round of the historical spiral - no, we can't take revenge, we don't need these games - to regain our own country, to return Russia to the ownership and disposal of its peoples.

After all, you can say this: Russia was stolen from us, first poisoning and killing what was the guardian of Russia's historical health is the socialist state system.

Already in 1948, in a memorandum by B. Wood, an employee of the Rockefeller Foundation, it was noted that the USSR gave the world an attractive example of a "successful development plan", while the United States did not develop "any counter-plan".

But the United States - as the Empire of Evil - could not and cannot work out any constructive counterplan acceptable to humanity as a whole. Peter Schweitzer, whom I mentioned earlier, the author of the book "Victory", lies – the nature of man, to the extent that he is a man, is disgusted not by communism, but by capitalism.

Modern capitalism cannot but be parasitic, it can no longer create and cannot but destroy. Therefore, the US counterplan was a two-pronged plan: 1) the collapse of the USSR and 2) such a globalization that ensures the life of the world community according to the camp principle "you die today, and I - tomorrow."

Today they talk about the inefficiency of socialism, about stagnation... Well, let's take a look at some statistics – in the USSR it was not so false, especially when it came to integral indicators.

If we take the gross social product (GSP) of Russia in 1913 as a unit, then by 1940 its growth was 5.1 times. This is despite the fact that since 1914 the Russian Empire waged a debilitating war, which shook the economy by the end of 1916 (the GP of old Russia in 1917 compared to 1913 fell by about one and a half times!).

From 1918 to 1921, the Civil War was going on in the RSFSR, complicated by the intervention and plunder of Russia by England, France, Japan, Germany, Turkey, the United States, Poland, Romania, Greece, White Czechs, etc.

In fact, a powerful economic upsurge began only in 1930, and in ten years
- until 1940 - the GP of the USSR increased by an average of almost 40% per year.

But when the starting level is low, such mighty numbers are understandable. Thus, the production of electricity was weak in Tsarist Russia, and by 1940 it had grown by 22 times compared to 1917, and the production of, for example, metal-cutting machine tools - even 292 times (in 1917, only 200 of them were produced in Russia). But coal production increased "only" 5.5 times, oil - 3.53 times, because in their production Russia and until 1917 occupied high positions in the world ranking.

However, if we compare the Soviet year of 1960, when we already had a fairly powerful economy, and 1970, then the GDP almost doubled in ten years - an increase of almost 10% per year.

From 1970 to 1980, the average annual increase in GDP was almost 7%. This is also a high number. Moreover, it could be twice as much if the country was ruled by dedicated and competent leaders. But even with them, in 1965-1985, the national income of the USSR grew 4 times, industrial production - 5 times, fixed assets - 7 times, and even agricultural production - 1.7 times.

Khrushchevism and Brezhnevism have done us great harm. So, before the death of Stalin in the USSR there were 124 thousand collective farms, after the dismissal of Khrushchev - 38 thousand, and as a result of the mediocre "enlargement" of collective farms on the recommendations of various kinds of fools and smart agents of influence in the 70s, there were already only 28 thousand.

In the same 70s, the material intensity in the economy of the USSR was twice as high as in the United States, that is, we spent twice as much raw materials and materials per unit of production, but the same fools and agents of influence did not see any particular danger in that.

Nevertheless, the USSR, even slowly poisoned, was a powerful economic organism.

Let's compare the growth rates of national income in different countries of the world from 1970 to 1980 (1960 = 1):

Страна	1970	1980	Прирост в сколько раз
СССР	2,0	3,2	1,6
Китай	1,5	2,6	1,73
США	1,5	1,9	1,27
ФРГ	1,6	2,0	1,25
Япония	2,7	4,3	1,59

As you can see, even in the era of mature Brezhnev's insanity and almost open preparations for the dismantling of socialism, the Soviet Union looked very good economically. At the same time, one should not forget that the volume of the "shadow" economy in the USSR by the beginning of the 80s

years was comparable to the volume of the official economy, and this increases the Soviet figure of "1.6" to a value of at least "2". As a result, we get the absolutely highest rate of growth of national income in the world. Moreover, it grew in the USSR not due to the introduction of "screwdriver" technologies, but due to comprehensive industrial development (although the share of raw materials in the gross social product increased).

In 1982, the Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences conducted an anonymous (in other words, fairly objective) survey of several tens of thousands of people in various Union republics. The comparison was based on five years, that is, compared to 1977. Here is the data for one of the most "dissatisfied" union republics - Ukrainian SSR:

Вопросы	Лучше	Как раньше	Хуже
Материально Вы стали жить	72	22	6
Вы питаетесь	60	32	8
Вы одеваетесь	64	31	5
Ваши жилищные условия стали	56	36	8
Вы отдыхаете	46	41	16
Пассажирский транспорт работает	44	33	23
Бытовое обслуживание стало	50	37	13
Получить квалифицир. медицин-скую помощь	58	29	13
В целом Вы считаете, что стало жить	76	19	5

Such is the social statistics of Soviet socialism, even in the stupid and hypocritical Brezhnev performance. Moreover, it was taken from the book of Yeltsin's colleague Mikhail Poltoranin, who was and remained an anti-Soviet and anti-communist even in 2011.

Today, in the results of such a survey, the numbers in the columns "Better" and "Worse" can be easily rearranged. But almost thirty years have passed, and if the Soviet Union had survived, then from the "As before" column, at least ten percent would have moved to the "Better" column, and something would also have moved from the "Worse" column to the "Better" column. would.

The above and numerous *unquoted* objective figures make it possible to speak not about the collapse, but about the convincing success of real socialism in those very short periods of time when it developed unrestrictedly, and even when it was already poisoned with might and main by the selfishness of the Brezhnev "elite".

However, the systemic base of the future direct betrayal, betrayal of the "elite" was gradually formed. When this base was strengthened and staffed in the form of "elite" degenerates and direct agents of influence, the darkest horse of world history, Mikhail Gorbachev, was *brought* to power in the USSR. The systemic conditions for the mass betrayal of the leading circles of the USSR were finally formed. And this meant the imminent not only political, but also the economic collapse of the country.

This was facilitated by a number of factors, which I will not discuss in detail here, but which I cannot point to.

The first major internal factor in the degradation of socialism was lack of feedback in the relationship between managers and managed.

Objectively, from a systemic point of view, real socialism, in order to confirm its viability and sustainable development, lacked, first of all, developed reverse

connections between Power and Mass on the basis of the principle of removal from leadership of people who are not capable of it or have lost such ability.

If you don't know how to lead in the interests of the people, get out. Previously, such drove in the neck Stalin, and after Stalin a strict law was needed in this regard.

The anarchist Bakunin shrewdly warned the masses about the danger of the degeneration of the revolutionaries after they came to power. However, the Marxists also understood the danger of such an option, and Lenin directly stated after October 1917 that if anything were to destroy us, it would be bureaucracy. *Therefore, Lenin defended the Marxist principle of the replacement of elected representatives of the people at any time.*

The real history of the USSR did not allow the development of socialist democracy - the formation of a new order of life under the leadership of Stalin was forced to take place in a mobilization, force majeure regime. Stalin simply did not have time to transfer the USSR to the rails of socialist democratization - he was killed.

The heavy legacy of tsarist Russia had a huge negative impact... On the one hand, the undeveloped, politically illiterate masses of the people, on the other hand, the strong "race" traditions of embezzlement and hypnosis of the "leading" chair. No matter how Stalin struggled with these two vices of Russia, they persisted in society like nits in a poorly washed head.

In the USSR, the role of a kind of feedback between the tasks of competent management and managers was performed by Stalin himself to a certain extent. He acted not so much by methods of repression, but by checking people in practice and removing those who did not justify their trust by transferring them to less responsible positions. And so it went downhill. An important role was played by open party meetings, party and economic assets - until their critical potential was emasculated by the Khrushchevites and Brezhnevism.

Relying on high-quality mass education and the all-round development of the masses, Stalin hoped to ensure the development of socialist democracy as well. A new multimillion-strong layer of developed citizens would be able to throw out from the leadership chairs, by one procedure or another, all those who turned out to be unsuitable for leadership.

However, four years of the beginning of the Great Patriotic War, during which at least ten million only active builders of socialism died (including - millions of conscious communists devoted to the idea of socialism) sharply reduced the mass personnel base for the creative and lasting development of socialism in the USSR.

The education of new socialist generations of conscious citizens became one of Stalin's main concerns after the war. But after Stalin's death, Khrushchev and the Khrushchevites gained the upper hand.

Gradually, a very rotten situation began to develop. In the socialist Soviet Union, where there was no private property (that is, a legal instrument for the owner to appropriate part of someone else's labor), the top leading Soviet "elite" (or rather, the most morally and politically degraded part of it) from a certain moment decided to strengthen and secure its well-being, which is precariously dependent on being in a leading "armchair", and secure it from nomenclature movements. *It was decided to exchange the fragile, dependent on the "armchair" power for large property.*

This property, on the one hand, would provide the "elite" with the same power, but strong, possessive, and on the other hand, it would allow them to openly eat, drink, debauchery, abominations and, in the words of the great Russian thinker and surgeon Nikolai Pirogov, "to walk with cheerful feet in the hours of national disasters.

The reborn part of the elite could not realize their desires in the socialist Soviet Union, and therefore their desires objectively coincided with the desires of the external enemies of the USSR and the installations of the "fifth column" within the USSR. Both those, and others, and still others wanted the collapse of the Soviet country for one and the same thing: to rule in it, divided and torn apart.

The classical Marxism of Marx and Engels did not foresee such a threat to socialism,

because its founders proceeded from the thesis of a more or less simultaneous world socialist revolution.

Lenin assumed this threat, but Stalin saw it especially sharply with his thesis about the aggravation of the class struggle as we moved towards communism. However, this most important idea of Stalin was declared erroneous. But Stalin hit "to the point"!

Back in 1990, the unforgettable Mikhail Gorbachev, in response to the question of the workers of the Izhora plant: "What are you going to do with Soviet millionaires?" - Without hesitation, he asked: "Do we have them?" And after two or three years, the "dear Russian", not being a dollar millionaire, was no longer considered a person.

The fact that not all former members of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, the CPSU Central Committee, union and republican ministers have become millionaires does not change anything in essence. After all, a minority of the Soviet leadership took part in the direct "conspiracy of the elites". The majority was simply paralyzed "unexpectedly" (for this majority and the whole country) by the surging events.

The second most important internal factor in the fall of socialism was the inferiority that had been developing since the 1960s, the systemic incompleteness of the socialization of the productive forces in the USSR. Practically all large-scale productive property in the USSR legally belonged to the whole of society, but the distribution of the total social product produced did not become a legal right and a practical matter of the whole society.

The function of formal public distribution more and more passed into the hands of a narrow group - the party-state leadership at all levels and the apparatus serving it. This does not mean the plundering of the social product (it took place, but on a relatively small scale), but the growing disproportion between supply and demand, between the shares of the gross product allocated for the development of the economy and for personal consumption, etc.

This happened against the background of a complete misunderstanding by the Khrushchev-Brezhnev state apparatus of the essence of social processes in human society in general and the essence of socialism in particular. The Khrushchevites, and even more so the leaders of Brezhnevism, completely neglected questions of theory, which were deeply alien to them due to their low intellectual level, political and civil underdevelopment.

All of the above became possible, among other things, because after the war, an *external factor in the fall of socialism* became more active - the subversive activities of capitalism to decompose and degenerate the Soviet "elite" and educate "agents of influence" from among them.

In 2010, the book "How traitors were trained" by the former head of the 5th (fighting dissidents) Directorate of the KGB of the USSR Philip Bobkov was published, which reports on the American "Lyota Plan" to create a powerful "fifth column" oriented to the West in the Soviet Union. However, it would be more correct to call this book "How Traitors Missed," because the former head of the political counterintelligence of the USSR never admitted that he and his colleagues in the leadership of the "Andropov" KGB of the USSR not only could not effectively counteract the "dissidents", but actually became accomplices of this "fifth column", *and after the collapse of the USSR, they essentially merged with it*. This happened with the bringing to power in the USSR of Mikhail Gorbachev and his accomplices in the liquidation of the USSR, and then with the "accession" of Yeltsin.

You can't hide an awl in a bag, and you want to boast, to remind yourself. Therefore, today the former secret is increasingly becoming clear, "illuminated" in interviews, in memoirs such as Ptorolaninsky's "Power in TNT equivalent" ... Biographical reference books, for example, "The Most Open People" by Nikolai Zenkovich, are interesting reading, where quite reliable, picturesque and a very unattractive collective portrait of the Gorbachev-Yeltsin destroyers of the USSR and Russia.

After all these revelations, only very naive people can doubt that

socialism in the USSR and the Soviet Union itself were destroyed as a result of the conscious actions of the top political and state leadership of the USSR, brought to power as a result of many years of subversive work by external forces.

In 1955, thirty-six years before the collapse of the USSR, such a danger was warned by the Russian foreign publicist E. Artsyuk, who wrote under the pseudonym "Alexander White" a brilliant article "The Russian Policy of Self-Preservation."

Ten years after the collapse of the USSR, Gorbachev himself boasted of his destruction.

Already in the late 60s, the largest agent of influence, the hidden anti-communist "Alexander N." Yakovlev, a future member of Gorbachev's Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU, held key positions in the Department of Agitation and Propaganda of the Central Committee of the CPSU. Yakovlev - one of the most rabid gravediggers of the USSR and socialism - began working in the apparatus of the Central Committee of the CPSU just after the death of Stalin, since 1953. The fact is quite symbolic. It is also symbolic that with the beginning of the "catastrophe", he promoted the same Mikhail Poltoranin to the upper "elite" echelons of power.

By the beginning of the 1970s, agents of influence in the structures of power were already in full swing encouraging dead-end projects and hindering the implementation of promising areas, organizing aimless from the standpoint of the development of the USSR (but quite expedient from the standpoint of the destruction of the USSR) spending public funds, etc.

A significant part of the natural resources of the USSR, instead of being used for the internal development of the USSR, was exported without special need and benefit.

By the mid-1980s, the conditions for the dismantling of socialism, which had degraded without feedback, had finally taken shape. After the liquidation of a strong candidate for the post of head of the USSR - the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belarus Masharov, after the political discrediting of another strong candidate - the first secretary of the Leningrad Regional Committee of the CPSU Romanov and the successive elimination of the three General Secretaries of the Central Committee of the CPSU, Brezhnev, Andropov and Chernenko, it was possible to hand over the reins of government to the future destroyer of the USSR Gorbachev.

Brezhnev was eliminated on the eve of his intention to transfer his powers to a more or less competent successor - the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine Shcherbitsky. It is very likely that the chairman of the KGB of the USSR Andropov, as well as earlier in the actions with Masharov and Romanov, took part in this operation.

Andropov himself, a no less obscure figure in our history than Gorbachev, was most likely eliminated on the principle "The Moor has done his job, the Moor must be removed" after he ensured Gorbachev's entry into high party orbits.

Chernenko from a completely healthy person was first turned into an invalid, and then eliminated in order to finally clear the way for Gorbachev.

At the same time, even by the mid-1980s, the masses of Soviet society had a huge potential for renewal and development. However, the mass of rank-and-file members of the CPSU was no longer the political vanguard of society, and practically the entire Soviet "elite" by that time was struck by decay and a lack of a sense of civic responsibility.

Yes, the Soviet Union, the socialist system, failed to maintain immunity to the infection of the "law given by Adam and Eve", or rather, to the infection of the private property ideology of selfishness. The USSR fell because its principles were gradually abolished in the USSR. The USSR gradually ceased to be allied, and Soviet, and socialist.

Socialism cannot but develop.

If it doesn't develop, it dies.

What about capitalism?

Well, modern capitalism cannot help but perish, rot, which it is doing "successfully" today, infecting everyone and everything and no longer even concealing the fact that it can only stink and directly crush the peoples with bomb strikes.

Secretly penetrating into the USSR, capitalism infected it with decay. And the "fifth column" was becoming more and more active. In the second half of the 1980s, under the conditions of the introduction of food stamps in the country, ravines littered with tons of beef and pork carcasses, sausages, etc. were discovered every now and then. them in order to discredit the Soviet

authorities.

When a critical situation was created in the country by the summer of 1991, the "elite" of the USSR showed itself, with rare exceptions, treasonably. In fact, not a single major party, statesman, not a single figure in science and culture, not a single head of the economy, the army, the KGB opposed the collapse of the USSR, and the vast majority of the "elite" actively contributed to it.

In the Soviet Armed Forces, except for Colonel-General Makashov, there was not a single honest marshal or general who openly stood in positions of loyalty to the oath to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and was ready to defend Soviet power.

In the allied ministries, not a single minister spoke in defense of the USSR.

The entire Academy of Sciences of the USSR remained silent, and Academician Sakharov became a serious personal factor in the collapse of the USSR. However, at the very last stage of the liquidation of the USSR, Sakharov could turn out to be uncontrollable and oppose the political assassination of an entire social system, therefore, it is very likely that Sakharov's death, "timely" for the "democrats", was also a political assassination.

Members of the Creative Unions of Soviet Writers, Composers, Artists, Cinematographers, Journalists, and Architects, for the most part, with the voluptuousness of perverts, bit the State that had nurtured them.

Gorbachev, together with the "elite" who betrayed the Motherland, put the State on the block.

Yeltsin and the "elite" that betrayed the Motherland dismembered the State.

Modern inhabitants of the Kremlin diligently water the dismembered State with the dead water of empty speeches, but they will never dare to splash it with the living water of the new reunification and collectivism.

As a result, socialism fell not because of its inability to develop effectively, not because of natural diseases, but as a result of an external and internal conspiracy.

Socialism has not died, it has been killed. And Soviet Russia was stolen from its peoples.

Moreover, they stole not only the social guarantees provided by the Soviet government and the Constitution of the USSR, but they also stole that huge material public property, that public property, which was declared "ownerless".

But everything could have been different, and at one time interesting ideas were put forward on this score, which are not outdated to this day and are suitable not only for Russia. I mean, in particular, the proposals of the American businessman Joseph Kolb.

The reader will now learn about this and something else.

Chapter 14

The socialist plan of businessman Kolb, or Once again - why socialism fell

Just in the days preceding the finale of the tragedy of the USSR, which was supposed to become a prologue to the new tragedies of the peoples of the USSR, an article by Joseph Kolb "The Psychological Burden of Soviet Privatization" was published in No. Its author was not a Marxist, he was a senior vice president of the company "Security Pacific-Secor Corpse", which operated in the field of global business development and marketing.

If Kolb's ideas had been accepted in the USSR in 1991 as a guide to action, then all those destructive processes that really determined the further crisis would hardly have been able to take place in the USSR. Of course, that is why the ideas of the American

businessman in 1991 could not be accepted in the collapsing USSR as a real state and social plan. But this plan was curious, with good potential, and you need to know about it.

Here is what Kolb suggested in 1991:

"The main part of the property in the Soviet Union belongs to *the people (emphasis in italics is mine everywhere. - S.K.)*, that is, the impersonal state. The management of this property is entrusted to individuals who administer this property *on behalf of the people*, but are largely accountable to the Union ministries. *Since the main part of the property was created by the common efforts of the people for 74 years, then the right of property can be made individual and transferred to every citizen of the Soviet Union.*

Kolb reported that meetings in Moscow and Leningrad, including meetings at the USSR Ministry of Finance, the Russian Ministry of Finance, the Moscow International Exchange, as well as meetings with the vice-mayor of Leningrad and employees of the Leningrad Exchange, helped in shaping his idea of privatization ...

According to Kolb's plan, from September 1, 1991, each of the inhabitants of the USSR was to receive an individual property certificate indicating the due share of national property with five guarantees (long-term rights): shares of his enterprise, contributions to mutual investment funds, etc. At the same time, the certificate investment in national wealth (SKNB) would be for citizens aged: up to 7 years - 150 thousand rubles; 7 ... 14 years - 300 thousand rubles; 15 ... 18 years old - 500 thousand rubles; 19 ... 20 years old - 600 thousand rubles, 21 ... 56 years old - 1 million rubles, over 56 years old - 500 thousand rubles. In 1991 prices! The current conversion factor can be taken to be around 150 and never less than 100.

Kolb admitted:

"A whole book could be written to develop this idea. The fact is that there are practically no precedents in history for a fair and effective transfer of ownership on such a scale as it exists in the USSR ... "

So, as we can see, the American businessman was ready to make every average Soviet family the owner of property worth more than two million rubles in the prices of the beginning of 1991, or at least two hundred million rubles (!!!) in the prices of 2011. And besides, there were real opportunities provided by all the then heritage of the USSR.

In all countries of the world, the class of owners was formed over the centuries, in the most difficult social battles for both the haves and the have-nots, while in the USSR it could arise almost instantly, in fact, overnight. And - in the volume of the whole society!

The class of owners in *the former USSR* emerged. But we all know *how* it came about. And precisely because it arose in such a way - not according to Kolb, but with "exactly the opposite", this quasi-"class" of "owners" does not have any rights to "its" property, just as it does not have any long-term historical prospects.

I knew about Kolb's plan from the moment it was published, since my article was also published in the same issue of the Foreign Ministry magazine. But only twenty years later, from the book of the former "neighbor" Yeltsin Mikhail Poltoranin, I learned that at that time there was another similar, purely domestic, plan of the then Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR, Chairman of the State Committee of the RSFSR for State Property Management from 21.11.1990 to 11/10/1991 by Mikhail Maley.

Poltoranin writes about it this way:

"It was supposed to transfer state property free of charge according to

justice to the entire population, to give each citizen his share, a nominal privatization check. It would cost about 600 times more than the Chubais voucher (*I must say, only 600 times - also not God knows what, but ...* - S.K.). The involvement of checks in the sale was not allowed - a measure against privatization. It was possible to buy shares of privatized objects on them and receive dividends. Dealers who stuffed bags of money on machinations in Gorbachev's timelessness were cut off ... "

Maley's "team" prepared a whole package of laws and by-laws for the transfer of Soviet state capitalism to the "people's", Scandinavian type, in the course of privatization, designed for 15 years.

Mikhail Maley was born in the village of Volyntsy, Verkhnedvinsky district, Vitebsk region, on October 9, 1941, during a harsh time, although the seed of his life was thrown into an era during a peaceful time. A child of the war, Maley went through the path in the USSR from an ordinary electrical engineer to the director of a large Moscow research institute, and although after 1991 he worked among Yeltsin's managers, he did not particularly come to court - apparently, the remnants of civic conscience interfered. On November 10, 1991, Maley was replaced as chairman of the RSFSR State Committee for State Property Management not by anyone, but by Chubais.

However, I didn't shed a tear from Maley's ideas - already because after getting to know them in 2011, a natural question arises both to Mikhail Poltoranin, who published his plan, and to Mikhail Maley himself: "Why didn't you, supposedly real Russian patriots, fight *then* for your plan by all possible and impossible means?"

The American Kolb found an opportunity to somehow convey his plan to the Soviet people right in 1991 - in real time. And two, according to Poltoranin, "real Russian patriots", one of whom was a professional in the field of *mass media*, and the other - Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers, "failed" to find opportunities to flood Moscow and the country with millions of leaflets with the theses of the Maley plan and with a message about who and how to counteract it.

(Poltoranin himself testifies that the most active opponents were the "people's" deputies Sergei Krasavchenko and Pyotr Filippov - very suspicious, as I myself already think, in terms of their belonging to numbered agents of Western influence).

Well, two Michaels are not archangels? In real time, the spirit was not enough? Not decided to quarrel with Yeltsin?

Eh!

Only twenty years later, after the oligarchic "Rossiyania" became a reality, Poltoranin stated that if Maley's plan had been implemented, then the people would actually turn into the master of the country, would be vitally interested in effective management at all levels, and the authorities would have to deal, as he writes, "not with hired cattle, but with a nation of interested owners."

In 2011, Poltoranin admits that in this case, the people would treat officials as hired managers: if they didn't cope with the matter, get out, we'll hire others. Stole - went to jail.

"With this option," Poltoranin concludes, "Russia would have been in for a fate prosperous democracies."

Everything, of course, is not so simple here - Russia could and can flourish only as a truly socialist state. *However, the idea itself to look at the socialist economy as a huge super-corporation, the shareholders of which must legally, with the execution of the relevant documents, be all citizens of the country, was a completely correct, sound and fruitful idea.* If Russia has a future, the socio-economic basis of the new socialism will have to be built taking into account the Kolb plan and the Maley plan.

And now let's return to the question: "Why did socialism fall and how Russia was stolen from its peoples?" Incidentally, this question is directly related to what has just been said.

It may seem to someone that below I am repeating something and saying what has already been said. Well, I will not argue - I will repeat myself in some ways, but I will repeat myself deliberately. No wonder they say: "Read once - do not read even once", and also: "Repetition is the mother of learning." And our lessons unlearned in the last century, we need to learn at least in the new century.

By the 80s of the last century, the USSR occupied places from the first to the fifth in various positions of development, most often having the second after the USA and rarely the third (after the USA and someone else like Japan or France) place.

For some positions, we lagged behind the leader (leaders) by three to five, for some - by seven to ten years, for some - and more ... Thus, the power supply of Soviet agriculture in the 80s was approximately the level reached by the United States in the 1950s or 1960s. Accordingly, the productivity of our agriculture was at the same level, that is, here we lagged behind the leader by twenty years.

But in one sphere of life, we in the USSR in the 60-80s lagged behind the developed West for fifty years, or even a good hundred years. This was the realm of control.

Yes, it would be foolish to deny the obvious fact that the West has long learned to select leading personnel and ensure their elimination and replacement. Moreover, for centuries both the "tops" and the "bottoms" have been studying this.

Incidentally, today the West itself is beginning to forget this science. The leadership of the Western world is increasingly degenerating at all levels - both the visible, political level, and the level of the "shadow" clubs of the world "elite", invisible to the masses.

The economic level of the Western leadership is being cretinized today - conceptually it becomes more and more rotten. However, above, speaking of the effectiveness of management in the West, I had in mind the past, "classical" times of the 1940s and 1970s.

In Stalin's USSR, a system of selection and effective training of personnel was quickly formed. There were many failures here, but in general the system worked and developed. Most of those who turned out to be unsuitable for leadership work, one way or another, sooner or later, but were eliminated.

However, after the assassination of Stalin and Beria, after the defeat of the "anti-party" group of Molotov - Malenkov - Kaganovich, the situation began to deteriorate more and more, reaching the peak of trouble in the Brezhnev and post-Brezhnev period. If in the West a frankly failed manager was immediately removed, then in the Khrushchev-Brezhnev USSR he could even rise higher - by the method of "shock sublimation" or due to the "hairy paw", that is, the protection of family ties, etc.

As a result, by the end of the Brezhnev period, the bulk of the leading cadres in all spheres of life were either fools or scoundrels. Anyone who did not understand what was happening was a fool. Who understood - a scoundrel.

This circumstance also became one of the factors in the collapse of socialism, but it itself was a derivative of a more fundamental negative factor - the cessation of development since the late 50s of the foundations of socialist democracy as a mechanism for the masses to influence the ruling stratum. We are talking about the same unrealized feedback.

Stalin in the post-war period in a narrow circle spoke directly about the absence of socialist democracy in the USSR *so far*, because the entire previous history of the USSR was forced to mobilize and did not allow the full development of socialist democratic institutions. But by 1953, Stalin had already set the task of such development as urgent. After all, as mentioned earlier, from a systemic point of view, real socialism lacked only *legislatively, in the Constitution, fixed* feedbacks to confirm its viability and further development.

If the fundamental reform of society and administration in the USSR outlined by Stalin in 1953 had been carried out, then the USSR could have continued to develop and live even without a pronounced leader, because the USSR would be inhabited by millions of more and more developed citizens. And they would form a free and mighty association of free

individuals. After all, a person acquires true freedom only in a free team of friends and like-minded people. And this team is invincible!

If the legislative and administrative principles in the USSR proceeded from the priority of removing from leadership people who are not capable of it (or have lost such ability), then there could be no question of any degradation of Soviet society. Already in the perestroika years, the "space" academician Raushenbakh, just a specialist in the field of technical control systems, allegedly jokingly remarked in an interview with Literaturnaya Gazeta that all the USSR needed for successful existence and development were two Communist parties, so that one could correct and criticize the other.

Note that Boris Viktorovich did not deny that both parties should be Communist, that is, they should stand on the platform of socialism, public property and Soviet power. As for the idea of two Communist Parties, that was the case when there is a joke in a joke.

By the way, once Stalin, even before the war, complained that we have a one-party system, not a two-party system.

The CPSU would fully fulfill its historical role if, having prepared in due course a legal and organizational basis corresponding to the epoch for the introduction of feedback loops and the development of socialist democracy, it would gradually transfer all its managerial functions to state and economic management bodies, reserving the role ideological vanguard of Soviet society.

It would only be logical and natural if, as socialism develops, the leading vanguard of society moves to where it is supposed to be in a reasonable society: to economic, cultural and educational structures. Accordingly, Soviet society would move towards de facto non-partisanship.

Non-partisanship is an undoubted sign of a developed, fully satisfying the needs of the citizens of society.

In this regard, it is appropriate to take a closer look at the United States. Formally, the United States has a two-party system, but in fact there are no parties. What does real partisanship mean? This means that if party A is in power, then society follows the same course. If Party B comes to power, then the course changes either drastically - up to a 180° turn, or at least significantly - at least 20–30°. And in the US, the change of Democrats to Republicans and vice versa has long meant a change in course by 2-3 degrees, a lot - by 5 degrees. In principle, the course always remains the same - imperialistic, self-serving, hypocritical and insolent.

The well-being of American society has long been ensured by the actual gangster (or little different from them) actions of the United States in relation to the outside world. But that is precisely why, within national boundaries, American society looks like (another question is for how long) a developed society that satisfies well the needs of the bulk of *its* citizens in a virtually non-partisan regime.

Understanding this, one can also understand that *a society caring for its members does not need parties*. And in a normally developing socialist society, the governing vanguard, the governing part of society, must be concentrated in state, economic, cultural and educational structures. If the political system of the USSR were to change in this direction, then Soviet society would quickly and definitively consolidate the virtually non-partisan character that it already had.

Apparently, Stalin, analyzing the course, achievements and miscalculations of the previous socialist construction, perfectly realized all of the above. However, Stalin's attempt to rectify the situation in 1953 led to the elimination of Stalin by the Khrushchevites.

As a result, not just a wealthy, but the only globally wealthy social system was brought to a comprehensive crisis that called into question the very viability of this system.

In addition, the post-war development of our society was fatally affected by such a negative factor as the presence of the world capitalist system. To

to survive, it had to try by any means to destroy the USSR and world socialism. It actually undertook this, transferring the class struggle from the sphere of class struggle to the sphere of interstate relations.

This external factor was associated with an internal negative factor - the "fifth column" created by the West inside the USSR, for which particularly favorable conditions existed in Russia. Long before the October Revolution of 1917, the liberal "intelligent" milieu in Russia developed a tradition of malice, servility to the West and, accordingly, enthusiastic betrayal of Russia's national interests.

In Soviet society, the long-standing liberal tradition has not been completely outlived. The authors of the plans for psychological warfare against the USSR knew this and made a bet on it, as it turned out - the right one.

That is, the project of a covert war against the USSR was conceived long ago, conceived by very old enemies of Russia and conceived cleverly. Today, much has been said about this by the authors of these plans themselves, but a purely logical analysis of post-war Soviet history in the light of the events of the 1980s and 1990s is enough to draw up a simple and correct scheme. And it well explains all the "experimental" points of the liberal experiment prepared by the secret services of the West on the USSR and its peoples.

This scheme is...

The victory in the Great Patriotic War created an entirely new position in the Soviet Union. We quickly restored our national economic potential in all areas and developed it with talent. For example, in the 1940s and 1950s, powerful windbreak forest belts were created throughout the steppe zone of the European part of the USSR. A grandiose accomplishment of the Soviet people, but still not understood in all its significance.

One of many...

Before our eyes, not only a new powerful world-class economy was growing up, but also a new society in general with hundreds of millions of people who recognize themselves, their children and grandchildren as the masters of the State and their own destiny. As a result, Soviet socialist Russia could rapidly and irresistibly break away. And if at the beginning of the century old Russia was dragged into the war that destroyed it, then in the middle of the century such an attempt was not crowned with success.

Other methods were required.

Actually, there was only one thing left: the deployment of diverse and long-term activities to undermine Soviet Russia from the inside - with the help of carefully sought out, selected and protected apostates, degenerates and scoundrels.

The lack of feedback and the associated almost complete lack of social immunity to external social infection brought by small doses and on the sly.

In parallel with the formation, so to speak, of a full-time, conscious "fifth column" of capitalism in the Khrushchev-Brezhnev USSR, the formation of an unprincipled, careerist "elite" that lived only for its own interests was taking place. This quantitatively significant selfish layer was to become over time and became an unconscious support for a relatively small "fifth column" consisting of conscious agents of Western influence.

So, the native Muscovite Sergei Krasavchenko (born 1940) and the native of Odessa Pyotr Filippov (born 1945), who later took root in Leningrad (!), mentioned above, are compared with members of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU and with the same Boris Yeltsin were - on the visible side - political trifle both in the late 80s and in 1991-1992.

It would seem that they were "small swimmers" - even in 1991 - even in comparison with Mikhail Maley and Mikhail Poltoranin. But they managed to thwart the adoption of the "Maleus plan", which could give Russia a truly civil, and not an oligarchic society.

Moreover, Filippov and Krasavchenko did not rise high and then, however, in sharp the moments of the end of 1991 influenced the situation decisively ...

Why did Sergei Krasavchenko and Pyotr Filippov manage to do this?

Who were they *really* - from *the invisible* side?

I don't know the exact answer.

But I'm guessing the correct answer.

But by 1991 there were not two, and not two dozen, and not even two hundred, but not less than two or three thousand such handsome and Filipino in the USSR.

Force!

But - for the time being - an invisible force.

A detailed analysis of life in the USSR since the second half of the 50s, carried out from the standpoint of assessing the impact on it of the shameless secret actions of the Western world, today shows a lot of truth...

One can take a fresh look at the "virgin epic" of 1954, at the "exposing of the personality cult" of 1956, at the June Plenum of the Central Committee of 1957, at the "economic reform" of 1965, on *the supposedly* idiocy of the "planning" of the Brezhnev State Planning Committee of the USSR, on the "stubborn" ideological dogma of the apparatus of the Central Committee of the CPSU, on the "unpromising" villages and the "landing" of the USSR on the "oil needle", on the devastating, dead-end irrigation and reclamation projects of the Ministry of Water Resources USSR, etc., etc.

Only conscious work carried out within the formally still socialist government bodies can also explain the formation by 1990 of a huge "shadow", in fact, a privately owned economy. Its annual turnover was not less than 150 billion rubles of that time, while the volume of money savings of the national economy of the USSR in 1986 was 301 billion rubles.

Of course, it is impossible to explain all the social and economic miscalculations of the last decades of the USSR only with malicious intent, but today it would not be an exaggeration to say that the share of this malicious intent in the general "idiocy" of Brezhnevism prevailed!

After the students, referents, graduate students and cadets of the 50s-60s-70s became major party secretaries, head. departments of the Central Committee, professors, generals, academicians and "ideologists", it was possible to begin the "perestroika" and cutting of the Soviet Union, turning it into a kind of CIS.

The desired result was ensured insofar as by that time almost the entire Soviet "elite" (mainly of the Brezhnev model) consisted of several generations of self-seekers, and even traitors, but in this "elite" there were almost no ideological and principled people ... Not without reason then there was an anecdote in which the grandfather-general, in response to the question of his grandson-Suvorovite, whether he could become a marshal, sighed: "No, granddaughter! You become a general. And the marshals have their grandchildren."

Marshals and generals, academicians and professors, members of the Politburo and first secretaries of regional and city committees, ministers and directors of factories and research institutes - all of them, with rare exceptions, fearlessly or not without some hesitation, but violated the oath of the USSR and betrayed it.

Apart from a number of tragic figures of the State Emergency Committee, among the major party leaders with experience, one can only name the former editor-in-chief of the theoretical journal of the Central Committee of the CPSU "Communist" Richard Kosolapov and the last first secretary of the CPSU MK Yuri Prokofiev, and among the major military figures - only General Albert Makashov as those who remained loyal to the Soviet Union.

Few people can be put next to these names ...

The betrayal of the "elite" was unparalleled and massive. Today, one or another frank confession in this regard is heard more and more often, starting with Gorbachev himself. But already in 1998, President Bush's national security adviser Brent Scowcroft admitted:

"My first reaction to the final lowering of the Soviet flag over the Kremlin was a feeling of pride in the role we played in achieving this ...

If Gorbachev had... the Stalinist type of political will and his determination predecessors, then we would still have the Soviet Union.

It would be a renewed and strengthened Soviet Union..."

One thing can be added to this: if only the first thousand (and what are the "thousands" - one or two hundred!) of the highest party, state and especially military leaders of the USSR had a feeling of genuine patriotism and determination, then no Gorbachevs and Yeltsins and no CIA and others like them could do what they did in 1991 and 1992.

In 1991, the peoples of the USSR were convinced that socialism is mismanagement, that socialism cannot give them stable social and material benefits, and the transition to capitalism, when the "owner" appears, will immediately give the people living "on coupons", the abundance that supposedly characterizes capitalism.

Miners in Kuzbass and Donbass banged their helmets on the asphalt of the squares and shouted that they wanted to work for their boss and go to the Canary Islands.

Well, twenty years have passed, and the same miners, looking around in fear, lest they someone heard "the wrong one", they complain that the owners traveling to the Canary Islands do not consider them to be people.

Serves right!

Somewhere on long-distance Soviet ships in August 1991 shouted: "Where are the communists? Overboard them!"

Twenty years have passed, and the once great maritime trading power has only the miserable remnants of the fleet, and the former screamers are glad at least for a temporary half-earning on the ships of foreign countries.

Serves right!

Similar processes took place on the eve of 1991 in the European socialist countries. However, as in the USSR, these were not natural processes of decay, but unnatural processes of the death of a naturally healthy, but deliberately poisoned organism.

In fact, the West and its undisputed leader, the United States, are responsible for the intent, preparation and organization of the political assassination of an entire social system. And if even unsuccessful attempts at political assassinations of individuals are regarded in the United States as the gravest crime, then how, one wonders, should a successful attempt at political assassination of many states be assessed?

The cumulative effect of negative factors - objective and subjective - led to the current crisis of socialism and its fall. However, the situation is well described by the thought expressed once: *"They say that communism is dead. No, he hasn't been born yet!"*

And Russia? Well, modern Russia is entering the most crucial stage of its more than a thousand-year history. Today, Russia has come to the last historical milestone, beyond which there may be either death or a final solution to all centuries-old Russian contradictions.

In Ukraine they say: "Bachili eyes, what they bathed, now I'll get enough, I want to povilaziti" ("You saw what you bought, now eat your fill, at least get out"). The sad truth of our days lies in the fact that the peoples of the USSR and Russia did not see what they were "buying", they did not see what they slipped and slipped into them. And buy - bought.

And at the same time - "bought".

But at least now we need to sort this out, not paying attention to the howling, barking, moaning and assurances of the "Russian intelligentsia" - the self-proclaimed "brain of the nation", which has long been reeking of thickened shit.

Long before the emergence of the USSR on the planet - a country where a sense of civic responsibility became an ethical and even legal norm - the great bourgeois democrat (however, he clearly evolved towards socialist ideas) Mark Twain wrote:

"A citizen who sees that the political clothes of his country are worn out, and at the same time is silent, does not agitate for the creation of new clothes, is not a citizen loyal to his homeland, he is a traitor. He cannot be forgiven even for the fact that he, perhaps, is the only one in the whole country who sees the wear and tear of her clothes. His duty is to agitate, no matter what..."

Despite everything! But after all, from the very beginning, from the first "Russian" day, the political clothes of Yeltsin's "Rossiyanin", thrown over Russia from someone else's shoulder, were worn long ago and thoroughly saturated with the miasma of the living corpse of capitalism. And already the one who did not talk about it from the very beginning was - by the definition of a great American - *traitor* to Russia.

And how should one define those who even today assure us that the political clothes of the current "Russian" are not the "new dress of the king" from Andersen's fairy tale, but a fashionable suit from Cardin?

At one time, the German intellectual Speer was fascinated and carried away by a certain "strong" political figure named Adolf Hitler. He became close to him, was the Minister of Armaments of the Third Reich and then, at the Nuremberg Trials, miraculously slipped away from loops.

Already in prison, Speer wrote a rather candid memoir, where he admitted the following (emphasis in italics mine throughout):

"... *As an intellectual*, I had to (in *the early 30s, from the moment I was infatuated with Hitler*. - S.K.) carefully collect documents and study different points of view *without any prejudice*, the way I considered architectural projects ...

... Not to think it over on my own, not to read, *taking into account my education*, books, newspapers and magazines of various directions ... *in itself was already a crime* ... "

You do not have to be seven spans in the forehead to catch the roll of thoughts of Mark Twain and Albert Speer and understand *what* they meant. But I'll explain...

Not to think, taking into account the education received, what happened to our Motherland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in different periods of its history, not to analyze documents with all care and not to study different points of view without any prejudice, but to rush into adventures of glorifying Gorbachev and then -

all the more so - Yeltsin, not to understand by the summer of 1991 what they and "their" politics are, what they bring to Russia, not to understand this and not to report their findings to the broad masses of the people was nothing else for the Soviet intelligentsia by the summer of 1991 like *a crime* !

A crime according to Mark Twain, and according to the repentant Albert Speer, and according to common sense, and - according to conscience, human and civil.

Today, we are far from an open trial of the Nuremberg type in the case of the murder of the USSR, although, perhaps, not as far as it seems to many. But if social conditions for something like this are created in Russia, then I propose in advance a measure of punishment for all those who have not yet repented and who have not knelt before the Soviet Union, slandered and betrayed by them, - not a bullet (much honor), not a noose, but *a hundred roses*.

With the confiscation of criminally acquired property, of course.

Chapter 15

September 1991: Conversation with Colonel Petrushenko

After the failure of the State Emergency Committee, the events from the end of August 1991 until the very end of this, with a damn mark, the years flew by with stunning (for the uninitiated majority) and with long-planned (for the dedicated minority) speed.

From August 21 to September 1, 1991, Estonia, Latvia, Ukraine, Moldova, Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan proclaimed "independence". What this meant, hardly anyone understood even in the republics themselves. After all, Estonia already proclaimed "sovereignty" on November 26, 1988 (!) of the year, Latvia - on July 28, 1989, Azerbaijan - on September 23, 1989.

The devil knows what has been going on in the country for a long time ... Almost all the republics proclaimed that "sovereignty", then "independence" since 1988, several times.

Armenia, for example, having started together with Lithuania in May 1989 with the declaration of "sovereignty", in August 1990 already declared "independence", etc. However, no one refused to supply raw materials and other things through union cooperation.

It was enough for Moscow to cut off, for example, Estonia, which gave the first impetus to this bacchanalia of "sovereignties" in November 1988, for a week from the supply of energy carriers and raw materials (with the exception, of course, of the "air bridges" of the West with violation of the state border of the USSR), for everything to become into place.

However, on the contrary, the collapse from Moscow was encouraged. Well, that's not news anymore.

On August 23, 1991, Yeltsin illegally suspended the activities of CPSU on the territory of the RSFSR.

On August 24, Gorbachev announced his resignation from the post of General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU.

And on September 2, 1991, the "work" of the 5th Extraordinary Congress of "People's" Deputies of the USSR began in Moscow, ingloriously and chaotically curtailed already on September 6.

On the same day, September 2, 1991, I again found myself in Moscow, but already on my way to vacation.

In the whirlwind of events throwing the country more and more *to the right and down*, I could not influence the situation, and a trip to Moscow at the end of August once again convinced me that there are no organized forces capable of resisting collapse in the USSR today.

Returning on August 24 from Moscow, rapidly becoming from the "red" "white" - how a person losing blood and vitality becomes whiter than paper - I also felt empty. And then the planned vacation turned up by the way. And I decided to go to Kerch to my parents - to wander alone along the shore of the Kazantip Bay, swim and think.

I left Arzamas-16 on Sunday, September 1st. In the train, he immediately fell on the top shelf and gave himself up to unhappy thoughts. I recalled one thing, then another, in particular - a demonstrative conversation that happened in July in "Arzamas-16" with a major "nuclear" admiral. A number of senior "nuclear" military men then came to us for the last, as it turned out, intersectoral commission of the Soviet era.

My official status did not allow me to get close to this admiral, but it turned out that when I was standing in the hall in front of the director's office of the nuclear center and talking with a colonel I knew from the military reception, the admiral with a couple of generals and retinue just approached our group.

One of the local colonels jokingly stated:

- We were not expecting you from there, but you decided to go in from the rear ...
- Yes, it is more reliable from the rear, - the admiral agreed.

And then I made up my mind. It was clear that morally the most unaffected public institution in the USSR by the harmful breath of the "catastrophe" was the Armed Forces, and the intervention of the army in the ongoing, as Gorbachev put it, "process" could save the country. And so I intervened in the conversation and said:

- There is one more good maneuver, Comrade Vice Admiral...
- Which? he asked, "substituting" as I expected.

- Go to the side.

"Uh, we've already gone so far from the side that you don't know where to go now," the admiral objected, again "substituting" the way I needed it.

"Well, there is a good recipe for that," I continued.

- Which?

Here I, without saying another word, patted myself on the shoulder and added only:

- And here!

Apparently, the military heads in Moscow were racking their brains over whether to turn to *this* medicine, because the admiral looked at his epaulettes on his shoulders and shook his head in understanding.

- No, the CIA conducted an analysis and came to the conclusion that in the Soviet Armed Forces There is no Pinochet...

Perhaps, not everyone remembers because of the prescription of years, so I remind you that General Pinochet carried out a successful military coup in Chile in 1973, but not a communist one, but an anti-communist one.

"Well," I said to that, "then it will be bad for us.

"Yes," agreed the admiral.

The people around were silent, but listened to us attentively. I did one last try:

Well, there is another option...

- Which? the Moscow admiral asked for the third time.

"Find Pinochet among the civilians..."

I was hoping to at least give a hint - yes, you, military people, contact someone from "civilian" state leadership, it cannot be that everything is sold like that.

But the admiral only waved his hand, and then the secretary jumped out of the director's office. and said that the plane from Moscow was coming in for a landing and we had to go to the airfield.

That was the end of our July conversation. A month later, such events occurred that showed that the CIA in the USSR was engaged not only in analysis, but also in the actions arising from this analysis. The "Soviet Pinochet" was never found in the Armed Forces of the USSR, but the anti-Soviet "Pinochetists" like Shaposhnikov, Grachev, Lebed showed up that August.

Under gloomy thoughts and the infrequent tapping of wheels at the joints, I fell asleep, and the next morning I was in Moscow. Things - at the Kursk railway station, and almost the whole day is free. The train to the Crimea left in the late afternoon, and on the way to Moscow I decided to try to see one of the three leaders of the Soyuz deputy group, with whom I knew a little.

Only in 1992 did I learn that in fact this group of people's deputies of the USSR was led by Georgy Ivanovich Tikhonov, now deceased. In 1991 he was the first, if I am not mistaken, Deputy Minister of Electrification of the USSR, in 1992 for a short time - Deputy Minister of the Russian Federation for CIS Affairs, and in the Second Duma - Chairman of the Committee for CIS Affairs and Relations with Compatriots Abroad. A very bright personality, Georgy Ivanovich later began, alas, to "fail", but when we met in 1992, he did not hide from anyone that he was serving the Soviet Union. On that we agreed with him.

And in 1991, from the Soyuz group, I knew only Colonel Alksnis, Yevgeny Kogan, and also Colonel Petrushenko.

Kogan, a large, overweight bearded man from the Baltics, walked limping with a cane (as he explained to me, this was the result of a fall in stormy weather from a great height while repairing a marine diesel engine on that refrigerator, where Kogan sailed either as a second or third mechanic) . He made a good impression - Alksnis was clearly weaker, but I got through to Nikolai Semyonovich (as far as I remember) Petrushenko.

We met Colonel Petrushenko in February 1991, and in July 1991 he came with a group of deputies to the nuclear "Arzamas-16", where he spoke brightly and juicy. But then an incident occurred, after which, alas, I was somewhat disappointed in the gallant colonel.

However, this is not about that, but about the fact that on the morning of September 2, 1991, Petrushenko turned up at the place in his room at the Moskva Hotel (not yet hidden), and I got through to him. Five minutes later his assistant, a lieutenant-colonel-missile officer, came downstairs to the hotel lobby and led me to the colonel. He was getting ready in the bathroom, going to the Kremlin, to the very unfinished extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR, which was supposed to open that day. The assistant told me about it.

"Comrade Colonel," I asked first of all, "now everything has already been decided. Do you understand that we must go ahead and demand the removal of Gorbachev? And to speak directly about his betrayal and Yeltsin's betrayal!"

Petrushenko was extremely excited - which was quite understandable - and resolutely stated:

- We'll fight.
- Keep in mind, everything depends on whether you can unite the majority on the basis of an extremely tough position. The law is yours. And most can be knocked together. People are confused, so they can be swayed in the right direction. The majority that Afanasiev spoke of can still not be missed.

The Colonel sighed. At one time, the "democrat" Yuri Afanasiev, rector of the Moscow Congress of Historical and Deputies, was "aggressively obedient" and it really was very obedient to the Gorbachev minority ruling it. Archival

But now!

Now Gorbachev has visibly declared himself as a figure of collapse. And not to get in his way and continue to agree with him was a crime for any people's deputy of the USSR, and - not only moral.

Speaking of which, we left the room, took the elevator down to the lobby, and from there to the street. Seeing Petrushenko (he was famous and recognizable then), a group of women rushed to us: "Comrade Colonel! Protect the USSR! Comrade Colonel, don't give up!" There were also people with banners in the passage, but the bulk of the human mass simply flowed through the center of Moscow on some morning business.

We went to Red Square and moved towards the Spassky Gates.

"Nikolai Semyonovich," I said, "the cause of the USSR has not yet been lost. But everything depends on the determination and pressure of those who are ready to fight for the USSR. You must directly accuse Gorbachev and all those who support him of high treason. And the Soviet core of the Congress - there it is, damn it! - must issue an appropriate appeal to the people and the army and act decisively.

"Yes, yes," Petrushenko agreed, not very confidently.

- I'm going on vacation, but if necessary, I can stay late, prepare some texts ... But you must have people who can do this, and the essence, I hope, is already crystal clear ... Nevertheless, if necessary, I will stay ...

And then Petrushenko asked a question that surprised me:

- Who is behind you?

Startled, I simply replied:

- Nobody...

- It's a pity...

I spread my hands and asked:

"So, do you need my help?"

Thank you, we have people...

We approached the Spassky Gate and stopped. Right and left, flowing around us, people with deputy badges passed under the arch of the gate - to the Congress. Under the same arch, slowing down, someone's black government "ZiL", long called by the people a "member carrier", drove by. And the flow of deputies thickened - it was already the beginning of the tenth.

"Well, then, Comrade Colonel, serve the Soviet Union," I said, holding out

hand.

"Yes, yes," Petrushenko said again, not very confidently.

And we broke up.

I left Red Square in the direction of the "atomic" hotel - to have breakfast. And Colonel Petrushenko and his colleagues went into historical oblivion. They could not do anything, and they did not have people, although they had the time and opportunity to unite around themselves an active core in the center and in the republics, and indeed to unite the whole people.

They failed and failed.

They were not bad, and even good people. However, a good person is not a profession. But they did not become professional politicians of the working majority, politicians of the people and for the people in two years.

Alas!

In the evening I was on a train from Moscow to the Crimea. For the time being, it is still on the territory of the Soviet Union.

Three weeks flew by quickly, and by the beginning of October I was already at home. And events continued to whip out of the advancing timelessness, like sewage from an erupted sewerage.

October 7, 1991 (just a gift to the future President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin for birthday) General Dzhokhar Dudayev committed a violent seizure of power in Chechnya.

On October 27, Dudayev was elected "president" of Chechnya.

On October 28, a new "tour of cartoons" of the 5th Extraordinary Congress of "People's" Deputies of the RSFSR began. The congress "democratically" approved Yeltsin's dictatorship and ended on November 6. Yeltsin's first act after that was a ban on the same day, November 6, of the CPSU and the Communist Party of the RSFSR. However, it was understandable - with a legally functioning Communist Party, no genuine "democracy" is possible.

On December 8, 1991, Yeltsin, as well as the "leaders" of Ukraine and Belarus, Kravchuk and Shushkevich, signed the Belovezhskaya agreement on the dissolution of the USSR. From any point of view, it was an illegal, unconstitutional, illegitimate, and, simply speaking, a criminal anti-state act.

On December 21, in Alma-Ata, the Declaration on the formation of the CIS was signed, again criminally, as part of the RSFSR, Ukraine, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.

On December 25, 1991, Gorbachev resigned from the post of President of the USSR, and on the same Day of the RSFSR was renamed simply RF.

Russia began to turn into a "Russian").

And in January 1992, the All-Army Officers' Meeting was held in the State Kremlin Palace, in which 4 (four!) thousand officers took part. At this meeting, "Aviation Marshal" Shaposhnikov, immediately after the signing of the Belovezhskaya Agreement, appointed by Yeltsin "Commander-in-Chief of the Joint Armed Forces of the Commonwealth", was publicly accused of betraying the interests of the military -

for some reason only the interests of the military, and not the interests of the entire Soviet people.

Shaposhnikov declared that he was ready to resign, and, "treading proudly, left starry hall.

But this is not essential...

Four thousand (!) strong men gathered in the Kremlin, who had seen the world, behind whose back was not yet a collapsed Soviet Army, were the troops of the Moscow Military District. However, these four thousand people themselves, armed even with their personal service weapons, that is, with only 9-mm Makarov pistols, gathered in one place and having experience in decisive actions, represented a potentially formidable force.

If warriors were gathered in the hall, faithful to the oath they had taken, if they were

Soviet patriots, then at least now, after the obvious treason of the top leadership of the USSR, the accusation thrown against "Marshal" Shaposhnikov on behalf of the Soviet officers, and then his departure should have become a signal for the Soviet Army to act in defense of the destroyed constitutional order.

I have already said that the call for a violent overthrow and the violent overthrow of the existing system are always qualified as the gravest state crime.

But after all, Gorbachev, Yeltsin, Kravchuk, Shushkevich and all their "accomplices" just did it! Therefore, *to call on the army and the people to forcibly preserve the USSR and defend the USSR with an armed hand was not only a legal right, but also a sacred duty of four thousand men in military uniform who gathered in January 1992 in the Kremlin.*

After all, they solemnly, in the face of their comrades, swore to the last breath to be devoted to their people, swore to defend the Motherland with dignity and honor, not sparing their blood and life itself ... The country handed over weapons to them and precisely for this! And now they finally gathered in one place.

They were openly sent to Moscow by the army, which was obliged to be one with the people, who In a referendum in the spring of 1991, he called for the preservation of the USSR.

And they gathered in the Kremlin when the crime against the USSR had already been committed.

Having fulfilled their oath, they would have saved the USSR.

Inactive, they covered up treason and themselves became traitors to the Soviet Motherland.

They became them - separately. Because they could remain the sons of the Soviet Motherland only collectively - speaking out in its defense.

Instead, the 43-year-old son of a worker from the village of Rvy in the Leninsky district of the Tula region, the commander of the Airborne Forces, Major General Pavel Grachev, for example, having 647 parachute jumps, betrayed both the Motherland and the working people - he betrayed on August 21, 1991. For this, he received from Gorbachev the extraordinary rank of Colonel General, and from his colleagues - in the near future - the nickname "Pasha-Mercedes".

However, Grachev's betrayal turned out to be not the only one, but typical. The betrayal of the Soviet generals (and, of course, the generals were obliged to raise troops) then became the norm behavior.

However, in the first place, the responsibility lay, of course, on the first persons.

At the initial moment of timelessness, Yeltsin himself "performed" the duties of the Minister of Defense of the Russian Federation, and from April 3, 1992, Grachev became his first deputy (from May 18, 1992 - Minister of Defense of the Russian Federation). But as early as February 13, 1992, Grachev was among the founders of JSC Aviation Company Avia-koninfo. This joint-stock company traded building materials, was engaged in logging and timber, operating cafes, restaurants, etc. A very suitable occupation for a "man without fear and reproach", who commanded the air guard of the Land of the Soviets.

One last fact of a quick retraining of a paratrooper into a shopkeeper is enough to treat the figure of Grachev only with disgust! But he had a lot more ahead of him - the collapse of the troops, and the trade in Russia's power, and the butchery over the White House in October 1993...

Is it any wonder that the only respected post-Soviet defense minister, Igor Nikolayevich Rodionov, does not maintain contact with his predecessors Sokolov, Yazov, Grachev and his replacement Sergeev. General Rodionov also refused to participate in the meeting of the former defense ministers of the USSR and the Russian Federation with Putin in 2003, as well as in the "anniversary" celebrations dedicated to the "200th anniversary of the Russian military department." Rodionov bluntly stated that if he took part in such events, then, willingly or unwillingly, he would become an accomplice of those

processes in the army, with which he does not agree.

This was all later, much later, and in September 1991, the deputies of the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR, the highest body of state power of the USSR, were obliged to take responsibility for calling on the army to fulfill its constitutional duty and defend the state system of the USSR. Without doing this, the deputies of the Congress, by their inaction, opened a list of direct, no longer hiding their treason, traitors to the Motherland.

Over the years, this list has been very, very replenished and, alas, continues to grow.
Will there come a moment of repentance and redemption by deeds?
Well, the future will show.

Chapter 16

The USSR is killed. Long live the USSR?

In the spring of 1991 - on Sunday, March 17 - a referendum "On the preservation of the renewed Union" was held in the USSR. I will recall its results a little later, but now I will say that the referendum was not held in a normal way everywhere.

Strange - the Constitution of the USSR was still in force, but in the Baltic states, in Moldova, Armenia and Georgia, the holding of a referendum was blocked. Now they often write that the referendum was allegedly "blocked by local authorities", but is this true? Who turns whom - dog tail or dog tail? Denying peoples the right to freely express their opinion means trampling on their most important social rights, in fact, usurping the power that belongs by law to the people. For this reason alone, the usurpers could be handed over simply by arresting them. However, the Gorbachev Kremlin decided that it was not a decree for the tyrant "leadership" of the national republics.

Nevertheless, even under these conditions, in the Baltic States, Moldavia, Armenia and Georgia, about 2 million people voted for the preservation of the USSR, with a total number of voters in these republics of about 10 million people. Taking into account the atmosphere of informational and almost physical terror established there, 2 million is not so little.

However, informational anti-Soviet terror then dominated even in Moscow, pasted over with leaflets, "Russia - "Yes!"", The Union - "No!". The functionaries of "Democratic Russia", who hardly concealed the fact that they were going to rallies in one, but "fifth" column, gathered 120 thousand people on the capital's Manezhnaya Square. This is out of almost 9 million people, that is, approximately 1.3% of the inhabitants. But the "democrats" (they were already beginning to be called, however, *crap-crats*) also brought in forces from the Moscow region, so the real percentage of mass participation was even less.

For comparison: in almost five million people in Leningrad, the "democrats" were able to recruit up to 70 thousand people for rallies - approximately 1.4% of the inhabitants - above the level of Moscow. But after all, Leningrad was the cradle of the Yeltsin counter-revolution, there "fought on the barricades" such "fathers" and "children" of "Russian democracy" as Sobchak, Chubais, Putin, Medvedev ...

But in the one and a half million Gorky, which is also not poor in such "forerunners" of "democracy" as Kiriyenko and Nemtsov, these "forerunners" managed to bring no more than 10 thousand to the square, that is, about 0.7% of the inhabitants.

Such dynamics of "democratization" for the RSFSR was quite representative - the farther from Moscow, the smaller the percentage of stinking "brains of the nation" in the region, the fewer people with minds and souls polluted by anti-Sovietism. Therefore, in general, the results of the referendum on March 17, 1991 were positive for the USSR (see table).

Республика	% голосовавших	% проголосовавших за СССР
РСФСР	75,4	71,3
Украинская ССР	83	70
Белорусская ССР	83	83
Узбекская ССР	95	93,7
Казахская ССР	89	94
Азербайджанская ССР	75	данные не найдены
Киргизская ССР	93	94,5
Таджикская ССР	97,7	98

It was not necessary to explain the high percentage of "yes" in the Central Asian republics by the pressure of local communist parties, just because the leader of Kyrgyzstan, for example, at that time was the anti-communist Akaev, who is defined by a number of very informed sources as a direct agent of influence associated with the CIA. However, more than 80% of the population of Kyrgyzstan supported the preservation of the USSR.

By the way, according to the latest sociological surveys, at least 70% of the population of the USSR reacted favorably to the appeal of the State Emergency Committee. In conditions when the Soviet people during the last three years before the collapse of the USSR were treated in an anti-Soviet spirit by the highest authorities, this is not just a lot, but a lot.

But the supreme power in the USSR at the end of 1991 did not have the slightest intention to act in the interests of the peoples and according to the will of the peoples. Actually, she had no intentions at all, by that time she had only tasks, and did not even hide it in real time. In confirmation, I will cite the testimony of a well-informed person, who personally worked a lot on the path of the destruction of the USSR - Grigory Yavlinsky. Already in 1992, in No. 44 of Literaturnaya Gazeta, he stated with amazing frankness (I quote from O. Platonov's book "Treason", M., "Algorithm", 2005, p. 399):

"... Boris Nikolayevich and his inner circle had clear political *attitudes (italics are mine everywhere)* - S. K.) ... First of all, it was a one-time (in the literal sense - in one day) not only political, but also economic collapse of the Union, the liquidation all conceivable coordinating economic bodies, including the financial, credit and monetary spheres. Further, a comprehensive separation of Russia from all the republics, including those that did not raise such a question, for example, Belarus, Kazakhstan. And a *number of other installations* - including, of course (? - S.K.), the introduction of multiple restrictions on free trade and market relations with the former Soviet republics ... This was a *political order* ... "

Even today, when I read this, my hands are shaking with nervous excitement - like so it is possible!

In the early 1990s, I hardly read the press - on the one hand, everything was clear and true, on the other hand, it was disgusting. And now, after reading those old confessions, I can't understand - how could it be done then and how can it be justified now?

So let them answer me - did the USSR collapse or was it not just collapsed, but *sadistically dismembered* ?

Is this decay? Oh no, this is a murder brutally committed by the Yeltsinoids and planned in advance by the West. After all, Yavlinsky directly uses the word "installations", and

installations *are given* by those who *give them*.

Just like they give *an order* for a political assassination, in this case, for an assassination. the whole political system.

And the question is, who are those who honor the memory of the political sadist and killer Yeltsin, as Putin, Medvedev and others like them do?

Yes, indeed, what has been happening in the past two decades in the expanses of the Motherland looks like a uniform theater of the absurd, if we mean the participants in the mass historical unnatural "action". For screenwriters and directors, what is happening is, *of course*, not an absurdity.

Let's take just one aspect of the activities of the current Kremlin dividers of Russia - the Caucasian. I take it precisely because *it was in the region of the Caucasus that a few years ago, not an unnatural centrifugal, but a natural centripetal process of reunification with Russia was actually born. However, the Kremlin, instead of smartly, resolutely encouraging and supporting this process, criminally crushed it "in the bud"*.

In 2008, for the first time since 1991, the trend towards isolation was replaced in the expanses of the Russian geopolitical space by a trend towards reunification: the peoples of South Ossetia and Abkhazia expressed their desire to re-enter *directly* into Russia.

At the same time, the principle of expanding Russia through the peaceful admission of new territories into it has already been enshrined in the Constitution of the Russian Federation - in Chapter 3 "Federal structure" (Article 65, paragraph 2), which says: "Admission to the Russian Federation and the formation of a new subject are carried out in accordance with the procedure established by the federal constitutional law.

The moment was potentially historic: against the background of the aggravation of the situation in the Caucasus, the two autonomies were ready to go hand in hand with Moscow. The Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation should have immediately voted the admission of Abkhazia and South Ossetia into the Russian Federation, at the same time addressing all the peoples of the Caucasus with an expression of the readiness of the Russian Federation to accept Georgia and Armenia into the federal Russian state - if this is the will of their peoples.

But could the Yeltsin-like Kremlin do this in 2008, if in 1991 Boris Yeltsin had a political order for a comprehensive separation of Russia from all the republics, and Vladimir Putin in 2006 stated that the problem was "not in relations between Georgia and Russia", but "in relations between Georgia and South Ossetia, between Georgia and Abkhazia"?..

How can one regard such a "*setting*" for the Kremlin's demonstrative and objectively inexplicable refusal of the role of Russia as an eternal gatherer of peoples? I think that such an attitude can only be regarded as anti-state and anti-Russian. And it means that Russia-gatherer is hated not only by the West, but also by the Kremlin Yeltsinoids - after all, the Dnieper region, Kyrgyzstan, North-Eastern Ukraine could follow South Ossetia and Abkhazia ...

Can the dismemberers live by the ideas of unification?

All the problems of the Caucasus are objectively *internal* in relation to the Russian geopolitical space and concern only Russia (in its broad historical sense) and the peoples of the Caucasus. The Caucasus has been linked with Russia for centuries by common ties - historical, geopolitical, civilizational and military (the blood of one Prince Bagration seals the fate of Russians and Georgians stronger than all UN resolutions!).

But Russia is bound by the same ties with other peoples of the Russian geopolitical space. These bonds are being torn by the enemies of Russia, but these bonds must be protected and restored! Do Vladimir Putin and Dmitry Medvedev personally, the official Kremlin and official Moscow as a whole have the right to take a position that pleases the enemies of Russia?

No, of course they don't.

But they act as the enemies of Russia need, and this once again exposes

themselves as enemies of Russia. This is not journalism, my dear reader, this is logic!

And it would be only logical for the Kremlin to remind the outside world about the now forgotten but legally correct Helsinki Accords of 1975, when the inviolability of post-war borders was fixed within the framework of the already forgotten Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE).

The West, violating its own obligations, illegally and hastily encouraged the separatism of the Baltic states in 1991, etc. And if we remember this, it will become clear that Russia's hands in its actions within the *Russian geopolitical space are untied by the actions of the West itself and the United States*. This becomes especially clear if we recall that Zbigniew Brzezinski once frankly admitted: "The Soviet Union was historical Russia, called the Soviet Union."

So, Brzezinski understands: the real Russia and the USSR are geopolitical synonyms.

It's time for us to understand this.

Let me remind you that Nikolai von Kreytor, a well-known Western political scientist, sociologist and lawyer, since 1976 the chairman of the Swedish Committee for the observance of the Helsinki Accords, the director of the Center for Research on Refugee Problems in New York, answered the question about the main goals of Russia's foreign policy in the future back in end of last century So:

"The goals are very clear: this is the restoration of the Soviet Union within the borders, confirmed by international law, namely, within the borders of 1945".

This is suggested to us by a good friend. So why do we behave towards ourselves as the worst - to ourselves - enemies? After all, Russia needs all the republics of the USSR, and all the republics of the USSR need Russia.

World stability was catastrophically undermined by separatist processes provoked from outside, which led to the disintegration of the Soviet Union. Therefore, the best way we can return to global stability is by restoring the new Soviet Union. But this is also the way to internal stability throughout the Russian geopolitical space!

And if Moscow really starts the process of a new gathering of a multinational Russian state, then only complete hypocrites, hopeless fools or outright scoundrels will be able to assess these actions of Russia as encouraging separatist processes and a violation of international law.

It is the outside world, which signed the Helsinki Act in 1975, broke the system of international law, starting to recognize the "independence" of the Baltic republics even before the Belovezhskaya Agreement, which, in turn, is "not legitimate".

The USSR, that is, historical Russia, which includes Kiev, Odessa, Tbilisi, Alma-Ata, Riga, Sevastopol, etc., fell victim to a contract killing ordered by external forces. But the USSR also fell victim to thoughtless separatism, fanned by the "national intelligentsia" in the republics of the USSR. It is time to say a few words about this, but, with the permission of the reader, I will say about it as I say - with a very personal coloring of my narrative.

I don't know how it is now, but a few years ago, Kiev Radio regularly aired the author's program "20 Minutes with Vladimir Yavorivsky", and my father, listening to it year after year, tried to write to the host, but did not know how to forward the written letter. And the probability of reading the letter on the air was zero - after all, a nationalist is an anti-Soviet in the square, and the nationalist Yavorivsky simply proceeded with anger towards everything Soviet. He hated it even more than "Moskal".

Father's wish came true only in April 2009 - two weeks before his death at the age of 86. Then, having arrived to my parents (still - to my parents!) in Kerch, I suggested to my father, already exhausted by the disease, to dictate a letter for its possible publication in one of the Moscow electronic publications focused on Ukraine.

So they did, and soon the text of the letter - I will not hide, supplemented by me, but in all the main parts belonging to my father, appeared on the Web on the website of the Fatherland movement. I considered it appropriate to insert into it only that part of myself that relates to Gogol, so the reader below will again meet with the speech of the gray-haired Taras Bulba ... However, this is the case when it does not interfere with remembering Taras's words again ...

So:

“Vladimir Yavorivsky!

You are presented as a “huge political fiend for the nourishment of culture and spirituality”, and you yourself publicly declare that your program is: “Tse Maidan, which one of you can speak out against, regardless of your position.” However, I, an old man who has lived a long time, was born in 1924 in Vinnitsa in the family of a Ukrainian teacher, survived the thirties, the war, the amazing post-war rise of the entire Soviet Country, and with it our native Ukraine, and already in my old age I turned out to be a witness (but no - not a participant) in the death of the State, I appeal to you without the hope that you will read my letter in front of a nationwide audience.

But you yourself, as I understand it, will read it. And, perhaps, you will think - after all, you have something human, after all, your mother gave birth to the world and wiped away children's tears with a towel your...

I am no longer afraid of anything, and even before I was not afraid to speak the truth whenever I considered it necessary. And I must say that when I hear your performances, I get the impression that a viper raises its head and looks for someone else to sting?

Why are you like this, Vladimir Yavorivsky?

You often present yourself as the chairman of the Writers' Union of Ukraine. Stendhal compared the writer to a mirror, but a mirror can reflect different things, and a mirror can be different, including crooked ones. A true writer is a person who is always on the side of the people, on the side of people who earn their living by honest work, and not by deceiving and stealing from their near and far.

You are called a writer... But a writer is impossible without readers... But were there many of them in our Ukraine before the socialist revolution? And one of the first major, as they say now, state projects of the Soviet government was a powerful and successful campaign to eliminate illiteracy.

Soviet Ukraine was one of the most reading countries in the world. Not only in cities and towns, but in every village, bookstores appeared, where books by classics of Ukrainian literature were freely sold, which you cannot find today with fire. You will not find it also because it is commercially unprofitable today to publish mass editions of Kotlyarevsky and Franko, Lesya Ukrainka and Marko Vovchok, Nechuy-Levytsky, Stefanyk and even the great Taras. You will not find books by real Ukrainian writers, and because in Ukraine the number of bookstores is catastrophically decreasing, and there are more and more readers.

less.

But there are illiterates. Yes, maybe it's for the best - fewer people will be able to read your supposedly true, but in fact false books. Although no one reads them anyway!

Every 20 minutes with Yavorivsky are fed up with hatred for Russia... Why would that be? After all, only enemies of peoples can sow enmity and hatred between peoples! This is criminal even under the constitutions of all democratic states!

You call yourself a writer. Once upon a time, writers were called engineers of human souls, and this was a good definition, because an engineer is a creator of the new. Not to distort human souls, but to create them in the interests of peace, friendship, honor, kindness and hard work - this is the task of the writer. And therefore, a true writer, a true master of the word, cannot but be a humanist, who himself is filled with peace and goodness ...

Where is your Peace and Kindness, Vladimir Yavorivsky?

You are trying to evoke and encourage almost physiological hatred and disgust

to the Soviet history of Ukraine. But who built Dneproges and Zaporizhstal, the Kiev and Kharkov aviation plants on Ukrainian soil, who created the mighty Dneprovsky rocket and space complex headed by the Yuzhnoye missile design bureau and the Dnepropetrovsk rocket plant? Who launched the aviation giants "Antey", "Ruslan", "Mriya" into high flight? Who created a powerful system of public and higher education in Ukraine?

After all, all this and many other glorious deeds are the result of the common friendly efforts of the vast Soviet Country, of the entire Soviet people, in which the Ukrainian people were one of the most significant elements! Full-fledged citizens of the Soviet Union, and not "guest workers", Ukrainians, together with Russian and Belarusian brothers, formed the basis of the greatest world Power!

Where is all this today? I ask you, Vladimir Yavorivsky!

You are mocking the fact that some Ukrainian women after the war wore luxurious European nightgowns, brought to them by the same supposedly "dark" husbands from supposedly enlightened Europe, as an upper dress. But these people - my contemporaries and comrades in arms and post-war reconstruction of the country - returned to Ukraine, devastated by this very "Europe". And it was easier to carry a silk shirt through that same Europe back to your kohana in a soldier's "sidor" - after all, even a needle pulls on the road. Yes, and we didn't really understand fashion then - there was such a time.

You call yourself a writer, a cultural figure. Culture elevates and unites people - if it is culture. And you? Where is it - our former culture? And where is your protest against what has become a terrible reality in Ukraine today?

I ask you, Volodymyr Yavorivsky: "Have you raised your voice against the fact that Ukrainian children are being poisoned with low-quality milk, drugs, soul-draining TV programs? Do you protest against the fact that Ukrainian girls are now leaving for the West to sell their youth and bodies?"

You are a deputy! You have great opportunities. How do you use them for real helping people?

Kids in schools are killing each other! Children! Could there be something similar in Soviet Ukraine? Not the one whose slanderous image you are trying to create in your programs, but the Ukraine that we remember, that lived before your eyes and in which you yourself lived and grew up.

Where did you study, where did you get your higher education and how much did it cost you? How did you become a writer?

You deny the importance of the Russian language for Ukraine! But do you know that Taras Did Shevchenko keep his diary in Russian?

You are turning Ukrainians against Russians, and half of Ukraine has relatives in Russia, and vice versa - millions of Russians have relatives in Ukraine. Why do you create and cherish hatred between brothers and sisters?

In Dante, sinners in hell go forward with their necks rolled back. This is how you, yourself constantly sinning against the past of the people, are trying to accustom the whole people to your sins! You are trying to turn the people's necks back, but not in order to see a flourishing, joyful and songful Soviet Ukraine in the past, but one "Holodomor", "Holodomor", "Holodomor" ...

I am a Ukrainian, from a good family name of an old Ukrainian family from Chernihiv region. The surname "Brezkun" is mentioned in the diaries of the General cornet of the Zaporizhia Army Nikolai Khanenko for 1733. And I say to you: "Calm down and repent - at least to yourself, and best of all - in public, atoning for your past public sins!"

And I will complete this message with an appeal to the memory and thoughts of one of the greatest figures of world culture, who most vividly and harmoniously combined the Ukrainian and Russian national and cultural principles. I mean, of course, Gogol.

UNESCO declared 2009 the Year of Gogol - not only the great Russian, but also the great Ukrainian writer, already because no one before or after Gogol penetrated so deeply, precisely, subtly and lovingly into the Ukrainian folk character ... When we are in our thoughts *and* feelings we turn to the eternal images of Ukrainian life, it is Gogol's Cossacks, Chumaks, girls and lads, godfathers and godfathers, colorful uncles and old people that pass before our mind's eye.

Ukrainian by birth and feeling, and, therefore, a Russian man doubly, Gogol - this is one of the pinnacles of both Russian culture and literature. But in what should we see the greatness and significance of Gogol today? Isn't it that the Ukrainian Gogol was a great patriot of the Russian land, impossible without Ukraine? It is widely known that all Russian literature came out of Gogol's "Overcoat", but it also came out of "Taras Bulba"!

Like any great humanist, Gogol is contemporary at all times, but for today's Great Russians, Belarusians and Ukrainians, as well as for all the best forces of the still existing Soviet people in general, the creator Taras Bulba has a special meaning! Especially relevant today are the words that Gogol put into the mouth of the great son of the Russian people and the Ukrainian people Taras Bulba.

"What is our comradeship," Taras said to his comrades-in-arms. - You heard from your fathers and grandfathers, in what honor our land was for everyone! .. The busurmans took everything, everything was lost; only we remained, orphans, yes, like a widow after a strong husband, orphan, just like us, our land! That's the time we, comrades, gave a hand to the brotherhood; this is what our comradeship stands on!.. I know that mean things have now begun in our land: they only think that they should have grain stacks, stacks and horse herds with them, so that their sealed honey would be intact in the cellars; adopt devil knows what busurman customs; they abhor their tongue; his own does not want to talk to his own; he sells his own, as they sell a soulless creature in a trading market. The mercy of a foreign king, and not even a king, but the foul mercy of a magnate who beats them in the face with his yellow shoe, is dearer to them than any brotherhood; but the last one is a scoundrel, whatever he is, even though he is all covered in soot and worship, he, brothers, has a grain of Russian feeling; and someday he will wake up and grab his head, cursing loudly blowing his life, ready to expiate the shameful deed with torments.

So spoke the ataman, "shaking his head silvered in Cossack deeds" ... And how topical his words are! How they look into tomorrow! And what can you say in response to these words, Vladimir Yavorivsky?

Without respect for you and your kind, but with the hope of your repentance.

Taras Konstantinovich Brezkun.

The letter got a lot of responses, and they all went something like this: "Yes! Printed grandfather so printed! Taperich of this horseradish is easier to paint over than to scrape off! "Well said! Finally, a man was found and was not too lazy to tell the reptile that she was a reptile! "If I were Yavorivsky, I would turn off the receiver," etc.

And soon Taras Brezkun, a citizen of the USSR since 1924, died. As before - the USSR.

From people only their deeds, thoughts and memory remain in the world.

And from the states?

Moral freaks like the "Ukrainian intellectual" Vladimir Yavorivsky existed and exist in every nation. Another thing is that in some historical periods there are fewer of them in society, and in some - more. But only in the USSR, by the mid-80s, these more or less educated moral freaks turned out to be - in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Tashkent, Alma-Ata, Tbilisi, Baku, Vilnius, Chisinau, Riga, Frunze, Dushanbe, Yerevan, Ashgabat, Tallinn, Gorky, Donetsk, Odessa, Novosibirsk,

Kharkov and a number of other large cities of the USSR - so much that in a matter of years they were able to shake and bring down the great Power, which never became their homeland, but on the land of which they were born after all.

Even Minsk became one of the centers of destruction, although it quickly recovered.

Here, after all, what happens ... In the country, before 1991, and after 1991, and even in 2011, millions of really educated people lived and live, worked and work, including those in the humanitarian sphere. Scientists, engineers, doctors, teachers, librarians, actors, musicians - there are many of them, those who today increase the amount of smart and kind in life.

But since those times, which were aptly called "catastrophe", on the surface of the social process in the USSR, and then in the "CIS" and "Rossiyanin", no more than ten thousand "intellectuals" began to flicker and flicker to this day. They are densely settled on central and regional television screens, they are annoyingly buzzing on the radio, shitting on electronic and printed pages. So they are the main scourge of Russia and the main evil in it.

All the Gorbachevs, Yeltsins, Chubais, Putins and Medvedevs are a product of the buzzing of those who arrogantly and arrogantly considered themselves the "brain" of the nation, although they are only its dregs.

All of them were and still are moral monsters - both those who raged and rage, obsessed with simply "intellectual" *nonsense*, and those who cold-bloodedly carried out and continue to carry out the political *order given to them*.

They were and still are freaks.

And we?

Even in the late 1980s, the Soviet Union looked to a very attractive future. Here I have a list of State scientific and technical programs published in 1989 in an official circulation of 200 copies, approved by Decree of the Council of Ministers of the USSR No. 1474 of December 30, 1988, on the day of the 66th anniversary of the formation of the USSR. The list provides a summary of the following programs:

- "Physics of High Energy",
- "High-temperature superconductivity",
- "Mars"
- Human genome
- "Perspective information technologies",
- "Technologies, machines and productions of the future",
- "Perspective materials",
- "The latest methods of bioengineering",
- "High-speed environmentally friendly transport",
- Environmentally friendly energy
- "Resource-saving and environmentally friendly processes of metallurgy and chemistry",
- "Highly efficient food production processes",
- "The fight against the most common diseases",
- "Stroyprogress-2000".

This is how the USSR was supposed to live at the end of the past and at the beginning of the new century, and how it would have lived if not for ...

Eh!

Here is part of the justification for just one program to combat the most common diseases (*italics mine throughout*):

"The program provides for research on the most common or dangerous types of diseases for society - atherosclerosis, cancer, influenza, hepatitis, diabetes mellitus, alcoholism, drug addiction, AIDS.

The introduction of research results into healthcare practice will *achieve*

2005:

the elimination of atherosclerosis as the main "epidemic" of non-communicable diseases and the increase in life expectancy of the country's population, and especially the male population, by an average of 8-10 years. The results will be achieved through the development of new drug and non-drug methods for the treatment of various forms of hypercholesterolemia, organizational measures to create a *specialized network of lipid departments* in hospitals in the country;

reduction by 20% of mortality from oncological diseases as a result of elucidation of the molecular genetic mechanisms of the transformation of a normal cell into a tumor cell;

elimination of controlled viral infections, primarily in children, and a *20-30% reduction in the incidence of the most common viral infections* (influenza, hepatitis) as a result of fundamental research into the mechanisms of virus virulence, virus ecology, and the creation of new drugs ... "

etc.

As part of the implementation of the Stroyprogress-2000 program, by 2005 it was planned to create 1000 ... 1500 automated production lines, 150 ... 200 automatic plants, introduce new architectural and planning solutions, promising construction and installation technologies with the development of about 40 billion Soviet rubles on new principles (this, from the standpoint of the construction industry, is at least 60-70 billion dollars!), etc. Among other things, this would mean the appearance in the country of up to 10 million new free apartments, which we, thanks to JSC Yeltsin and Co. have not received.

In addition, in 2005 it was planned to master in the production of promising generations of trucks and cars, buses and electric vehicles, new resource-saving low-waste technologies, breeding new breed groups of farm animals, etc.

That's what the peoples of the USSR could do for the last twenty-three years - for their own good.

What have we been doing all these years?

And here's what...

By 1991, we, roughly speaking, but accurately, missed the possibility of such a life and are doing the same to this day. And we are already sitting almost up to our nostrils *in this very one* - not the best smelling ...

Yes, what is there to argue and play up: we allowed ourselves to be deceived and ruined. We turned out to be historical not even fools, but *idiots*. And as a result, *we are very far behind ourselves, from the potential level of the USSR in 2011, which could become a reality if we had lived all these years in the USSR.*

Yes, the historical truth is that we, speaking, I repeat, rudely, however - exactly, historically obsr ... lis.

But what does a person do if a similar sin happened to him, and he does not want to continue to sit in, sorry, shit? Well, first of all, he acknowledges this sad fact itself. And then he begins to wash off *the sticky and odorous* - to wash off violently, tearing the skin, not sparing strength and water.

And, only having washed off, he will have the right to say: "I am a person again, and not a piece of shit!"

On February 18, 1922, Lenin wrote to the Deputy Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and the Council Labor and Defense of the RSFSR Tsyurube:

"... The trade department of the State Bank is not at all "bargaining", but the same g ... bureaucratic, like everything else in the RSFSR ... We have a lot of such g ... as departments ... "

It was not an acknowledgment of collapse and not intellectual grumbling - in the words of Lenin

sounded sincere hatred for everything unhealthy, *smelly*, preventing us from living. Lenin spoke like this - roughly, but precisely - because he did not want to live in shit, as any normal person does not want to. By the way, this is also why Lenin was a staunch opponent of capitalism. Indeed, already in the time of Lenin, capitalism began to turn society into a spiritual garbage can, just as it is now turning the entire planet into a physical garbage can, in addition to the spiritual one.

Lenin, and after him Stalin, were not afraid to call a spade a spade, but only so that socialist Russia, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, would grow out of bast-bast Russia.

And what about Putin, Medvedev and other Kremlinoids?

They messed up themselves, dirtied and dirtied the country, and at the same time *they sit in this very same place* and chirp: "Skolkovo, Skolkovo, Skolkovo..."

How much is possible?

Some modern "wise minnows" assure us: "We have the state that we have, and we cannot have any other. You have to live with what you have."

But with what is, you can only die. Having the "state" that we have, in the foreseeable future, we will generally lose our more than a thousand-year-old statehood.

And is it possible that even today, at the beginning of the 21st century, the "notebook" "intelligentsia" "Russian" and "CIS", and with it, by the way, that part of the Internet community that was infected by Khrushchev's "sixties" and Yeltsin's "Adventists" hatred for the USSR, is it really so difficult for all of them to understand a few simple things, namely ...

If the USSR followed the path of Stalin and Beria, that is, the path of developing mass education as the basis of socialist democracy, as well as the path of competent and efficient management of the economy and social life with the introduction of feedback, then the USSR would be indestructible and indestructible.

The USSR did not collapse, but was destroyed by internal traitors and external provocateurs.

The USSR was not terminally ill, but was poisoned by many years of subversive work by the West and the internal "fifth" column. And he was poisoned because by the very fact of his existence, and not by the allegedly mythical "aggressiveness", he posed a mortal threat to the future of the world private property elite.

The external plans for the political assassination of the USSR had no precedents in world history, but, nevertheless, the USSR fell, in the end, not because of the sophistication of these plans, but because the executors of such plans were found in the USSR itself. The USSR fell victim to the Soviet "elite" intelligentsia. In the decisive 80s of the XX century, instead of ideological defense of the USSR, it began to create a deceitful, ugly image of it in the public consciousness and deceived the masses.

The people, deceived by the "intelligentsia", could not organize themselves and resist the betrayal at first by the Soviet nomenklatura "elite", and then by the new "Yeltsinoid" "elites".

The Soviet intelligentsia of the USSR slandered.

The Soviet leadership of the USSR betrayed.

But the people of the USSR prostr ... I.

And this is despite the fact that people, as a social community, only lived on Earth as human beings, from the late thirties to the mid-fifties of the last century and then - by inertia - until about the end of the sixties.

And they lived in the USSR.

The Stalin era laid a foundation in Russia that was fantastic in terms of its creative potential. The cultural, educational, scientific, technical, economic and spiritual result of it was such that, starting from it, it was possible to ensure the unprecedented flourishing of the Soviet Universe!

A powerful multimillion-strong human layer has formed in the Soviet country - active, perfectly professionally educated, combining the experience of mature generations with the aspirations and energy of the young, to a large extent altruistic, ready to live in the name of the speedy solution of grandiose and excitingly interesting professional and social tasks. The leaders of these strata of society were scientists and specialists from advanced defense industries - rocket and space, aviation, nuclear, electronics, shipbuilding ...

But just as enthusiastically, professionally - at a level no lower than the world level - not only they were ready to think and create, but also doctors, metallurgists, architects, breeders, machine-tool and tank builders, railway workers, livestock breeders and agronomists, builders and power engineers, biologists and geologists, teachers and artists, athletes and landscapers...

It was up to the right leadership and the right course - political, moral, economic. However, if the Stalin period of our history provided the basis for prosperity, then the Khrushchev-Brezhnev period, with all its visible and undoubted achievements in all spheres of society, formed the basis for the rapid and total degradation of the State and the people who created it.

Degradation, as explanatory dictionaries tell us, is a decline, a gradual decrease in some quality, a process of changing something in the direction of deterioration, a loss of previously accumulated qualities.

In the Gorbachev-Yeltsin period and the Yeltsinoid period that continues to this day, the total degradation of the State and the people who created it has become a fact.

But is it not clear why the people degraded, why the miners were so zealously and so stupidly banging their helmets on the asphalt of the squares in 1991? The people were deceived, the people turned their brains on one side by those who led them - they led them politically, economically, emotionally ... Even in these conditions, the people did not recoil from the idea of socialism and the USSR, but did not actively defend them either. After all, the people had to be organized, but they were disorganized - various kinds of Gorbachevs, Ryzhkovs, Yakovlevs, Yeltsins, Shevardnadzes, Starovoitovs, Sobchaks and ... And, let's not forget - Poltoranins ...

During the years of "perestroika", correctly called later "the catastrophe", the notorious Gumilev passionarity was in full swing among the masses of the people. If at the head of the country's policy, at the head of its economy, science, army, mass media, were not traitors and self-seekers, but clever patriots, who were then enough in the country, but who did not have positions of power precisely because Brezhnevism pushed them aside all who are capable of power in the name of the people, then ...

Then we would have today a powerful, the first power in the world with a prosperous, developed, kind and socially active people...

Now...

Now in the book "Poltoranin's Cocktail" on page 77 I find the words: "Even a complete death - 100%, seriously! - our people can no longer be intimidated, and you can't push them to the cause. Yes, no one is counting on the people. M.N. Poltoranin several times starts talking about a radical change of power. There is nothing to expect from the people..."

How stupid and arrogant this is...

Yes, today the people are allegedly "silent", but - only supposedly! To himself he thinks his thought, but does he think it right? A casual conversation with a taxi driver of about fifty in a provincial town... I'm talking about the collapse of Russia, the arrogance of the oligarchs, the destruction of the Academy of Sciences, Putin's mediocrity and the complete incapacity of United Russia... In response, at first - a stony face, and then it breaks through: "Who instead of Putin? Communists? Enough, they will start shooting again, this has already happened ... Previously, I had no right vote..."

I was dumbfounded - it's not the oligarch who drives next to me, but an obvious hard worker who moonlights as a driver, I ask:

"What, you didn't have it before?"

Evil response:

- No!

Previously, he, without realizing it, had not so much the right to vote as the right to the country. The poet Yaroslav Smelyakov has bitter but precise lines about a washerwoman who works hard day after day under the roar of passing trains:

And he doesn't know, fool
Rinsing clothes,
What is a dictatorship in Russia
Not someone else's, but hers...

Our taxi driver, and that washerwoman, and the entire mass of the people in 1991 missed their dictatorship, their right to the country, to its wealth and income, and to this day they have not understood this ... And an attempt to explain to them this considerable number of ordinary people is met to this day not with interest, but with rejection ...

Why are they configured like this? Yes, because they are set up that way!

But who set them up like that?

Is it necessary to explain for a long time - who?

In the same "Poltoranin Cocktail" I read that in 1996 Poltoranin "together with his old colleague Bella Kurkova" allegedly "won a competition for a television frequency in St. Petersburg" and, having taken a loan "from some (? - S.K.) British" created the television company "TV-3", which is now known as a "real mystical" channel ... Then Poltoranin sold the channel to Potanin (what a touching phonetic consonance, reflecting political identity), and now "quite comfortably" exists in a dacha in a cottage village near Moscow ...

At the time when Mikhail Poltoranin and his "old comrade-in-arms" were turning television geshefts, diluting the theater of the absurd organized by him and his accomplices with mysticism, I somehow wrote down about a hundred, as I called them, "misprints" in one sitting, where there were also such: "Curve paraBELLUM", "Dirty BELLIE", "BELLY spots of the TV screen", "BELLITA" ... There was also a "hooray" - "Hurrah! The Duma is FULLY AWAY!"

The humor was, of course, bitter, out of hopelessness... The Poltoranins and the parabells had television channels to pour spiritual dirt, mystical devilry into the minds and souls of the masses of the people - in the name of strengthening a very real, pragmatic political Satanism.

And I have...

And for people like me...

What did we have then, except for the bitterness of understanding and the feeling of powerlessness?

What do we have now?

Well, there was and remains love for our Soviet Motherland and the belief that it will be reborn - first in the minds and souls, cleansed of mysticism and dirty BELLIZNA, and then reborn in the political life of the wiser peoples of the USSR ...

The path to this is complex, not easy, and, at the same time, simple. Everything depends on people. Napoleon believed that three things were needed for the success of the war: money, money and money ... The first Rockefellers believed that what money would not do, big money would do ... But even the biggest money is powerless if the people, or at least its most active part are aware of their fundamental interests and act in their name, and not in spite of them ...

If the people are imbued with an understanding of their fate and a sense of political truth,
Then...

Then February, organized by the elite of tsarism, is replaced by people's October, the bastard NEP - by the great five-year plans, 1941 - 1945, and the post-war ruins - revived cities, giants of industry, rest houses, pioneer

camps, Gagarin's "Vostok" ...

And only if the people are stupefied, it begins to allegedly "keep silent"...

But the silence of the people is actually a formidable sign.

Yes, the USSR was killed - by the Khrushchev-Brezhnev-Gorbachev "elite" under the connivance of the people confused by the same elite.

But that civilizational Calvary, to which the USSR, historical Russia, was brought, can become the starting point for the resurrection of the USSR.

And here is what, in connection with the above, I suggest everyone to think about ...

Whoever and whatever claims otherwise, man is a product of social conditions. And if society is humane, if its members are brought up by people, then Valery Chkalov and Yuri Gagarin turn out to be the heroes of the day, and in a time of trials, Zoya and Shura Kosmodemyansky, Oleg Koshevoy and Ulyana Gromova, Alexander Matrosov and Dmitry Medvedev-chekist appear in society.

If the society is anti-human, then its members are brought up as subhuman intellectually and spiritually, and Ksenia Sobchak, Anfisa Chekhova and Dmitry Medvedev, the "president", become the "heroes of the day".

Of course, this is a scheme, and as in any other scheme, it is impossible to squeeze into it all the diversity and variety of life. But the scheme, if it is a correct scheme, allows you to understand the essence.

So, you can ask yourself questions: "Who, how and why destroyed the USSR?" - and find the right answers to them. But in the end, the USSR fell because back in the USSR, we were gradually, year after year, weaned from living in society as people, beat off the taste for it ...

We have been weaned and largely weaned from *wanting* to be human.

Therefore, the secret of the resurrection of the USSR is, in a certain sense, very, I repeat, simple. Of course, it is necessary to organize and conduct a political struggle for the USSR - without this, there will be no life for Russia in the future. But the main thing is to re-experience the burning craving for life in a smart and fair society without oligarchs, stocks and stock exchanges. And as soon as we again want to be people and live like people, the USSR will rise again!

Yes, at first it will rise only in our minds and souls.

Then - in our collective will.

And finally - in the reality of a new smart and active working day.